Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-240
Friday
15 December 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-240 *15 December 1989*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Romania Submits Pact Proposal at Vienna Talks *[TASS]* 1
Grinevskiy Interviewed on CFE Talks Problems *[Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD 8 Dec]* 1
Soviet-U.S. Chemical Weapons Talks Session Ends *[Moscow Radio]* 3
Official Cited on U.S. Arms Control Policies *[PRAVDA 15 Dec]* 3

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Gorbachev's Helsinki-2 Initiative Viewed 4
U.S., European Reactions *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 14 Dec]* 4
Commentary Views World Response *[Potapov on Moscow International]* 4
Pact General Staff Chiefs Meet in Moscow 11 Dec *[TASS]* 5

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

USSR-U.S. Consultative Commission Meeting Ends *[TASS]* 6
Commentator Praises Baker's European Tour *[Glazunov on Moscow International]* 6
Military Expert on Results of Malta Meeting *[TASS]* 6
U.S. To Build 'Star Wars' Station in Portugal *[Cherevskiy on Moscow International]* 7
Supreme Soviet Delegation's U.S. Trip Summarized *[IZVESTIYA 8 Dec]* 7
U.S. Official Received at Foreign Ministry *[TASS]* 8
U.S. Experts End Work at Rovno Nuclear Plant *[TASS]* 8
U.S. Agriculture Official Received in Moscow *[IZVESTIYA 9 Dec]* 8

China

CPSU Delegation To Visit Beijing 23 Dec *[AFP]* 8
CPSU's Falin Briefs Chinese Ambassador *[PRAVDA 14 Dec]* 9
CPSU Official Views Relations With CPC *[Moscow International]* 9
Li Peng Denies PRC Reform 'Regressing' *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 14 Dec]* 9

Northeast Asia

Mutual Concessions Urged in DPRK-ROK Talks *[(Petrov) on Moscow International]* 10
Future of PRC-ROK Ties Described *[Moscow International]* 10
Nature of USSR-ROK Consular Ties Discussed *[Moscow International]* 11
USSR-South Korea Begin Academic Exchange *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 49]* 11
USSR Wants Fishing Off Kuril Islands Banned *[Tokyo KYODO]* 11
Japanese Firm Buys Soviet Orbital Station *[Moscow International]* 11
Mongolian Foreign Minister Plans USSR Visit *[PRAVDA 14 Dec]* 11
Mongolian Complaints at Slow Reform Noted *[IZVESTIYA 14 Dec]* 12

Southeast Asia & Pacific

U.S. Role in Philippines Rebellion Viewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Dec]* 12
New Zealand Foreign Minister Outlines Policies *[IZVESTIYA 13 Dec]* 13

Near East & South Asia

Shevardnadze Receives Afghan Foreign Minister *[TASS]* 14
Relocation of Afghan Refugees Termed 'Mistake' *[Batyev on Moscow International]* 14

Iran's Midterm Elections Previewed *[Andreyev on Moscow International]* 15
Iranian Export of Fundamentalism Discussed *[Vasilyev on Moscow Radio Peace and Progress]* 16
U.S. Efforts for Bases in Sri Lanka Criticized *[Andreyev on Moscow International]* 16

Sub-Saharan Africa

Commentary on Kenya's Screening of Somalis *[Tashin on Moscow International]* 17
Ethiopia, TPLF Talks Termed 'No Small Step' *[Mikhaylov on Moscow International]* 18
Horn of Africa Nations Urged to Seek Peace *[Mikhaylov on Moscow International]* 18
UN Best Hope To Solve Conflicts *[Mikhaylov on Moscow International]* 19

East Europe

Yakovlev Leaves Moscow for E. Berlin *[TASS]* 19
Discusses Ties With SED'S Gysi *[East Berlin ADN]* 19
SED's Gysi Opposed to Reunification *[TRUD 15 Dec]* 20
Baker, Modrow Advocate Stability, View Ties *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Dec]* 22
Soviets May Have Prevented Leipzig 'Bloodbath' *[Cologne Radio]* 22
Perfilyev on CPCZ's Mlynar, Dubcek Visits *[Prague CTK]* 22
CSSR Presidential Nominees, Developments Noted *[IZVESTIYA 15 Dec]* 22
Democratic Forum Member Views CPCZ Situation *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 14 Dec]* 23
100,000 at Sofia Rally Support BCP Reforms *[IZVESTIYA 15 Dec]* 24
Bulgarian Economic, Political Changes Viewed *[Moscow Radio]* 24
Romania Seen Tightening Border Controls *[IZVESTIYA 14 Dec]* 25
Moscow Soiree Marks Albanian Anniversary *[PRAVDA 14 Dec]* 25

West Europe

Problems Facing Germanys, Reunification Viewed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 15 Dec]* 25
Bavarian Premier Interviewed on East-West Ties *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 13 Dec]* 27
Belousov, Italian Envoy View Defense Conversion *[TASS]* 28
Proposed Soviet-Turkish Economic Projects Listed *[Istanbul HURRIYET 7 Dec]* 28
GUARDIAN 'Fabrication' on Cyprus Base Decried *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Dec]* 28
UK Moves Against Suspected War Criminals Noted *[IZVESTIYA 15 Dec]* 29

Latin America & Caribbean

Cuba Stresses Food Output, 'Impending Problems' *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Dec]* 29

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Congress of People's Deputies

Congress Marks Andrey Sakharov's Death *[Moscow Radio]* 30
Biography of Andrey Sakharov *[TASS]* 30
Funeral Commission Formed *[TASS]* 30
Congress Debate on Article 6 Viewed *[Moscow International]* 31
Maslyukov Argues Need for Central Planning *[PRAVDA 15 Dec]* 31
Comments on Economy *[Moscow Radio]* 32
Congressional Body Discusses Economic Plan *[TASS]* 34
'Scathing Criticism of the Government' Heard *[TASS]* 34
Ryzhkov, Vorotnikov Debate Economy 14 Dec *[Moscow Radio]* 35
Vorotnikov Chairs Debate *[TASS]* 35
Congress Debates Economic Reform 36
Abalkin Comments *[TASS]* 36
Deputies Analyze Economic Reform Progress
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 5 Dec] 36
More on Discussion of Economic Plan *[TASS]* 37
14 Dec Panel Discussions Described *[TASS]* 37
Commentator Approves 'Common Market' Idea *[IZVESTIYA 15 Dec]* 38
Deputies Criticized for Taking Gorbachev Lead *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 15 Dec]* 39

Gorbachev Meets With Deputies 14 Dec *[PRAVDA 15 Dec]* 40
Further on Meeting *[TASS]* 40
More on Gorbachev, Uoka 12 Dec Congress Exchange *[Moscow TV]* 40
Lithuanian Deputies Appeal Conflict *[Vilnius International]* 41
Gorbachev Meets With Lithuanian Deputies *[Vilnius International]* 41
Further on Meeting *[Vilnius Radio]* 41
Estonian Delegate Complains About Coverage *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Dec]* 42
Credentials of Additional Deputies Recognized *[PRAVDA 14 Dec]* 43
Yakovlev Chairs 1939 Pact Review Meeting *[Moscow TV]* 43

Political & Social

Deputies Discuss Possible Political Opposition *[Belgrade TANJUG]* 43
Gorbachev Urged To Concentrate on Supreme Soviet
[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 12 Dec] 43
Readers Find Gorbachev 'Too Liberal,' 'Familiar' *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 14 Dec]* 44
Poll Shows Most Favor Economic Reform *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 13 Dec]* 44
Search for CPSU Deputy To Replace Abalkin Starts *[PRAVDA 30 Nov]* 46
New Moscow Party Chief Promises Openness *[MOSCOW NEWS No 49]* 46
Prokofyev 25 Nov Moscow Address Reported *[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 26 Nov]* 47
21 Nov Leningrad Joint Plenum Described *[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 23 Nov]* 49
Gidaspov Advocates 'Centralism' *[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 22 Nov]* 51
Plenum Issues Appeal *[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 23 Nov]* 60
Personnel Changes Made *[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 22 Nov]* 61
Leningrad Proletarian Fundamentalists Criticized *[IZVESTIYA 9 Dec]* 61
Draft Law Widens Power of Leningrad Soviet *[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 21 Nov]* 66
Leningrad Draft Action Program Discussed *[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 21 Nov]* 66
Lithuanian Party Plenum Called for 15 Dec *[Moscow Radio]* 68
Yazov, Lithuanian Deputies View Military Service *[Vilnius Radio]* 68
Kaunas Executive Committee Resigns *[Vilnius Radio]* 68
Lithuania Bans Removal of Archives *[Vilnius Radio]* 69
Latvian Local Election Results Announced *[TASS]* 69
Further Election Results *[Moscow TV]* 69
Results Examined *[Riga International]* 69
Latvian Paper Condemns 1939-41 Treaties *[Riga International]* 70
Riga Gorkom Advises Against Party Split *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 28 Nov]* 70
Latvian Interfront Officials Interviewed *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 17 Nov]* 71
Latvian Draft Citizenship Law Criticized *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 22 Oct]* 73
Estonia's Vyalyas on Independence, Gorbachev *[Tallinn International]* 77
Estonia To Introduce Purchase Cards *[Tallinn Radio]* 78
Estonian Election Results Viewed *[TRUD 12 Dec]* 78
Estonian Work Collectives Union Registered *[Tallinn Radio]* 78
New Ukraine First Deputy Premier Appointed *[Kiev Radio]* 78
Ukraine Perestroyka Group Joins Democratic Bloc *[Kiev Radio]* 79
Ukraine Students Confederation Formed *[Kiev International]* 79
Moldavia Floats Loan To Cover Budget Deficit *[TASS]* 79
Proceedings of Belorussian Party Plenum Detailed *[SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA 19 Oct]* 79
Armenia Sending Supplies to NKAO by Air *[Yerevan Radio]* 80
Railroad Official on Armenia Blockade Aftermath *[IZVESTIYA 13 Dec]* 80
Situation in Armenian Border Village Reported *[Yerevan Radio]* 80
World Support for Armenian Quake Victims *[TASS]* 81
Georgian Party Removes South Osetia Obkom Chief *[ZARYA VOSTOKA 14 Nov]* 82
Early Nov Unrest in South Osetia Viewed *[MOLODEZH GRUZZI 16 Nov]* 83
Trial of Former Uzbek Party Head Opens in Moscow *[Moscow Radio]* 85
Khodzhayev Trial Detailed *[Moscow Radio]* 85
1,224 Deaths Reported in Bashkiria Pipeline Blast *[Moscow Radio]* 85
RSFSR People's Front Program Criticized *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 26 Nov]* 85
Perestroyka Seen 'Renewing' Socialism *[PRAVDA 2 Dec]* 87
Rogachev on Conference on Socialism's Problems *[Moscow International]* 90
Discussion of New Party By-Laws *[PRAVDA 6 Dec]* 91
Apathy, Lack of Competition Mar Kazakh Elections *[IZVESTIYA 13 Dec]* 92

CPSU's Girenko Tours Crimean Oblast 30 Nov-2 Dec *[PRAVDA 3 Dec]* 92
AUCCTU Plenum Information Report *[TRUD 5 Dec]* 93
Resolution on Elections *[TRUD 6 Dec]* 93
Telephone Link Answers Miners' Questions *[TRUD 10 Nov]* 95
Yakovlev Briefs Church Figures on Papal Meeting *[TASS]* 95
Details of New Magazine Outlined *[PRAVDA 16 Nov]* 95

Economic

Foreign Aid Viewed, Revisions Suggested *[MOSCOW NEWS No 49]* 96
Workers Air Problems at Railroad Conference *[IZVESTIYA 11 Dec]* 97
Criticism of Trade Union Organs Discussed *[TRUD 2 Dec]* 98
West Kazakh Gold Mine Visit Reported *[PRAVDA 12 Dec]* 100

Scientific

TASS Reports 'Mir' Space Activities 101
Crewmen Hold Press Conference 101
Work Schedule Reported 101
Reportage on Nuclear Power Stations 102
AES Accidents Listed *[IZVESTIYA 9 Dec]* 102
Nuclear Plant Safety, Closure Examined *[London MORNING STAR 4 Dec]* 103
AES Construction Policy *[Moscow Radio]* 104

Military

Lizichev Attends Academy Jubilee Meeting *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Dec]* 105
Tallinn Conference Views Draft Changes *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 9 Dec]* 105
Soldiers From Uzbekistan, Caucasus Clash 12 Dec *[Moscow International]* 106
Restricted Border Zones To Be Reduced *[Moscow TV]* 106
Military Contribution to Economy Detailed *[Moscow International]* 106

Romania Submits Pact Proposal at Vienna Talks

LD1412205189 Moscow TASS in English 2041 GMT 14 Dec 89

[Text] Vienna December 14 TASS—By TASS correspondent Vladimir Smelov:

The Warsaw Treaty states have made a major move at the talks on conventional weapons in Europe, which is expected to help achieve progress at the Vienna negotiations.

Romanian chief delegate Theodor Malescanu submitted a draft treaty on conventional armed forces in Europe at today's plenary meeting on behalf of the seven delegations of the socialist countries.

The move is important for the negotiations since the draft treaty is a prototype of a future multilateral agreement which is expected to turn a new page in the European development.

The obligation of all member states to reduce to agreed low-limit levels (and not to exceed them) of six types of conventional weapons is the document's key provision: the numerical strength of troops, tanks, artillery pieces, infantry combat motor vehicles, war planes and helicopter gunships.

The treaty's structure covers virtually all issues of the talks. As for the area of its application, the Warsaw Treaty [words indistinct] abides by the Vienna mandate and is ready to reproduce all its relevant provison [words indistinct] the text. It is envisaged that the treaty will be of unlimited duration.

The Soviet chief delegate, ambassador at large Oleg Grinevskiy told TASS that, while compiling the draft, the Warsaw Treaty states put forth the goal to promote the speediest possible progress of the talks.

The activities of working groups would become more efficient and purposeful if experts get a chance to discuss and agree positions of member states in the context of articles of a future treaty, Grinevskiy said.

The present draft is, naturally, based on the stand of the seven states. "However, this does not mean that we ignored our partners' views," he noted.

It is expected that, at long last, the NATO countries will submit their draft treaty at today's plenary meeting, although they promised to do so at the end of the previous round, over a month ago.

However, the much-touted document has not been submitted even during the present, fourth, round due to differences between partners in the North Atlantic alliance, above all between Greece and Turkey.

The differences are evidently so great that, according to news agencies, they are being discussed at a meeting of the NATO Council's session which opened at the level of foreign ministers in Brussels today.

Circles close to the talks note that the NATO delegations asked Warsaw Treaty partners in the Vienna forum "to stretch" today's plenary meeting and to continue it after an interval at 19:00, Moscow time.

It is expected that by this time the NATO Council session will achieve a compromise and make a decision to submit the NATO draft of a treaty for the Vienna talks.

The Warsaw Treaty delegations agreed to meet their NATO partners halfway and extend the plenary meeting.

Grinevskiy Interviewed on CFE Talks Problems

PM1312114389 Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD in Dutch 8 Dec 89 p 9

[Interview in Vienna with Oleg Grinevskiy, leader of the Soviet delegation to the talks on Conventional Forces in Europe, CFE, by Chris van Esterik: "Vienna Is Not a Political Dice Game"; date not given]

[Text] [Van Esterik] For some time now you have been advocating here in Vienna the strategy of speeding up the talks. But in Malta little new impetus was given to the disarmament conference. Is that not a setback for the progress of the talks here?

[Grinevskiy] I take a completely different view. The greatest result from Malta was the creation of a mechanism for accelerating the talks here in Vienna, the START talks in Geneva, and the talks on chemical weapons. President Bush and President Gorbachev decided to sign these agreements next year. Second, they decided to involve their foreign ministers more closely in the preparation of these accords. They will meet each other a few times next year for this purpose. Thus the mechanism has been set up and you should not underestimate that.

[Van Esterik] Do you not have the feeling that the conference on conventional arms sometimes threatens to come to a dead end? After nine months the two alliances have only reached agreement on "half" a category—namely a section of artillery—out of six categories (tanks, aircraft, artillery, and so on).

[Grinevskiy] Speaking honestly, I am very disappointed with what is happening here at the moment. Sometimes the situation here reminds me of the theater of the absurd. I must say: From the beginning it has been the NATO countries which have placed the problem of tank reductions at the center of these talks. Indeed, in our view, too, NATO has a good reason to do this. We reached an agreement. That means that we will cut tanks by 40,000 on our side against not more than a couple of thousand on the NATO side.

We now find ourselves in an impasse because NATO does not want to include light tanks in the reductions. We do not have these tanks. If you weigh our 40,000 tanks against these couple of hundred light tanks—then I do not understand. (Theoretically, after an agreement

NATO could fill all of NATO territory in Europe with these modern light tanks, if they remain outside the agreement on reductions—Chris van Esterik's note)

[Van Esterik] But you know that NATO is also divided on this point.

[Grinevskiy] Yes, I know. But it is not in the interest of NATO or the whole of Europe to hold things up here—whether it be for archaic national interests, or because they have a good vehicle, or because they have invested a lot of money in it and perhaps want to sell it on the world market. They just do not want to talk about it. So they are holding up next year's agreement, proposed at the highest level within NATO.

[Van Esterik] We are talking about Britain, I assume.

[Grinevskiy] Exactly.

[Van Esterik] What would change in Europe if the conference were to succeed next year contrary to expectation?

[Grinevskiy] Then both East and West could review the whole concept of their security policy and move away from armaments in the direction of political institutions. We welcome the dynamic, and sometimes even dramatic changes in East Europe, because they are a renewal of society. We need money for the renewal of our economy—that is by no means a secret. West Europe needs money to be able to compete with such economic giants as the United States, Japan, and Southeast Asia. If we do no longer feel this threat from the West, then why should we spend so much money on all this military hardware? If we succeed, this would mean a drastic change in the nature of NATO and the Warsaw Pact. From the military to the political.

[Van Esterik] But what then is the common political character of the Warsaw Pact? If now you already have so many different systems in East Europe? Surely you no longer have a "political umbrella"?

[Grinevskiy] Do all the NATO countries have the same political system? Surely they have a pluralistic system?

[Van Esterik] But why do you still need a military alliance in the longer term?

[Grinevskiy] I would not say "in the longer term"—I do not now how long these alliances will remain necessary. The Helsinki process could bring us to a completely new situation in Europe.

[Van Esterik] On the other hand, without NATO and the Warsaw Pact we could come very quickly to a situation in Europe like the one in 1914, which is even more dangerous maybe than the cold war.

[Grinevskiy] The comparison is incorrect. Since 1914 the situation has changed completely.

[Van Esterik] If the pressure from the alliances falls away, what will happen, for example, to the problems between the Hungarians and the Romanians, the Greeks and the Turks, to mention just two potential flashpoints?

[Grinevskiy] The mistake you are making is that you measure everything by the present situation. But history changes things. Just look at the current relationship between France and Germany and compare it with the past. Could anyone predict the great changes in East Europe even two months ago?

[Van Esterik] Could a number of countries in East Europe be neutral in that future system?

[Grinevskiy] We respect the choice of each nation to live as it wants. But I have not heard anywhere that any single country in our alliance wants to change its status. All the Warsaw Pact leaders were in Moscow this week and all want to remain in the Warsaw Pact because at the present moment it is for them a factor which guarantees stability.

[Van Esterik] Oskar Lafontaine, deputy chairman of the SPD, has said that he is in favor of the withdrawal of U.S. troops from West Germany, if the Soviet troops were to leave the GDR. Is that a realistic option?

[Grinevskiy] If you are simply talking about today, then I do not think that it is very realistic, but as a prospect for the future I do not rule it out at all, it is quite possible.

[Van Esterik] How do view a united Germany?

[Grinevskiy] At the present moment it is not on the political agenda. But if the Europe of the future develops in the direction of what I call Helsinki-2, I do not rule it out at that time.

[Van Esterik] If I were Oleg Grinevskiy I would think: Next year there are elections in the FRG. If by that time no agreement has been reached in Vienna, there is a very great chance of a Social Democratic government. Consequently this makes an agreement in Vienna easier for the Warsaw Pact. So why don't I wait until after December 1990 for an accord?

[Grinevskiy] Because we are not playing some little political game here; it is not a political dice game. We in the Soviet Union have a very important interest in this accord. We need a new political structure in Europe, not minor changes. We need a renewal of the whole situation in Europe in order to free our hands for the renewal of our country. Economically, politically, and socially. That is why it is in our interest to reach this agreement as soon as possible.

[Van Esterik] Can you describe the difference in style between pre-Gorbachev and post-Gorbachev Soviet diplomacy?

[Grinevskiy] I receive my instructions—that is normal for all diplomats. But now I have a free hand to look for various ways to carry out these instructions. I can make proposals and recommend what in my opinion is the best solution. I try to find the best approach to reach the goal.

In the past I received from Moscow one prescribed approach which had to be followed strictly. I am now freer in looking into the possibilities of solving problems together with others.

[Van Esterik] In 10 years' time there will perhaps be no work in the field of disarmament for you as a professional diplomat, if we take the optimistic view. What will you do then?

[Grinevskiy] Then I will write a truthful book about our work here. In comparison Sherlock Holmes will seem like kid stuff.

Soviet-U.S. Chemical Weapons Talks Session Ends

LD1512113289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] The regular round of Soviet-U.S. consultations on questions of banning chemical weapons has ended in Geneva. Specific issues connected with the preparation of a future convention on the full banning and elimination of chemical weapons were discussed.

Official Cited on U.S. Arms Control Policies

PM1512100789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Dec 89 Second Edition p 7

[Own correspondent V. Gan dispatch under the general heading: "Disarmament Step by Step"]

[Text] Washington—The results of the latest round of Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms, which has ended in Geneva, have once again confirmed the obvious—that the U.S. approach to the problems of ABM defense and space remains one of the chief, most difficult problems in the way of a treaty on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive arms.

The U.S. State Department reported recently that the G. Bush administration has officially rejected the Soviet proposals for limiting the testing and deployment of space weapons. Washington has repeated yet again its old proposal to allow the sides to test ABM systems and components in space, making a "broad" interpretation of the 1972 ABM Treaty. This proposal was formulated by the Reagan Administration and was turned down both by the Soviet Union and by the U.S. Congress as tending to foster the militarization of space.

In other words, the deadlock over this matter has still not been overcome, even though at the recent summit meeting off the Malta coast the leaders of both states evaluated positively the prospects for concluding a treaty on the reduction of strategic offensive arms next year. What do U.S. experts think about the situation at the Geneva talks, which concern the most important contemporary problems? I decided to put this question to Antonia Chayes, a well-known specialist on arms control problems and U.S. under secretary of the Air Force in the Carter Administration.

At the beginning of the conversation A. Chayes went back to the September talks in Wyoming between USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker. It was then that the USSR declared its readiness to sign and ratify a treaty on strategic offensive arms even if, when its drafting is complete, an accord on the ABM problem has not been reached.

"In my opinion," A. Chayes said, "as a result of the Soviet Union's new approach there has been a sharp increase in the chances of the speediest conclusion of a treaty on strategic offensive arms, the chief obstacle in its way having been eliminated.

"The problems of SDI and the ABM Treaty, which the United States is creating, are not of a conceptual but of a political nature. The Bush administration—and this worries me as a specialist in the arms control sphere—is concerned about the attitude of right-wingers toward it. I do not consider this justified."

"Many problems still remain at the talks on strategic offensive arms, too. One of them is control [kontrol] over sea-launched nuclear cruise missiles, on which no progress has yet been made either. What does A. Chayes think about this?"

"In my opinion, it is still harder to resolve this problem than the ABM and SDI question. Perhaps it will be necessary to seek some technological monitoring methods. Although time is limited, nonetheless it is our ally. We are beginning to acquire experience of openness in the sphere of monitoring, for example in connection with the Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles. Mistrust of one another is beginning to diminish. In principle the whole question is what kind of security from the viewpoint of monitoring each side wishes to ensure for itself and which military secrets to waive here. It is necessary to work on formulating a compromise in this direction. Previously it was easy to make demands of the USSR, since we knew in advance that, given its totally closed nature, the response from there would always be negative. Questions of monitoring were a political weapon in the hands of those people in the United States who would have liked to block all arms control. But now that we are hearing in reply not 'no' but 'yes,' we must formulate our position more carefully.

"The USSR is displaying a very positive approach," A. Chayes concluded. "It is all the time seeking to conclude agreements, and it clearly holds the initiative. I rate the USSR's position very highly, and I believe that if the present favorable opportunity is missed, we will lose a historic chance."

Gorbachev's Helsinki-2 Initiative Viewed

U.S., European Reactions

PM1412111789 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 14 Dec 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS political observer Sergey Kulik article: "Constructive Approach. J. Baker on the Prospects for an All-European Summit Meeting"]

[Text] The current tour of a number of West European countries by U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker has automatically placed on the agenda, as it were, the question of Washington's attitude to the prospect of convening an all-European summit meeting. M.S. Gorbachev's new initiative came as a surprise to the U.S. Administration, and eyewitnesses say that, when asked to voice his opinion of it on the aircraft heading for Valletta, President G. Bush confined himself to this statement: "I will discuss any ideas proposed. Afterward we will give our answer."

In Malta, however, it was hard to catch the president's "OK" with regard to the Soviet proposal, although Bush spoke quite highly of the Helsinki process itself. After the conference in Brussels U.S. commentators maintained that the White House had tried to substitute the idea of a conference of the 23 states participating in the Vienna talks for the question of Helsinki-2.

But what did West Europeans themselves say about this? Italy, on whose soil the call for a new all-European meeting was made, declared through G. de Michelis, its foreign minister: "M. Gorbachev's call for Helsinki-2 is very important. This meeting will be held under conditions whereby all its participants are aware that they belong primarily to a single civilization, not to different ideologies. We all share common principles and values common to all mankind, which are the defense of human rights, democratic pluralism, and freedom of conscience and choice. The mutual recognition of these points marks a historic shift." Many FRG politicians also spoke in support of the new Soviet initiative.

However, a kind of conversion of "quantity into quality" on the question of an all-European forum occurred after M.S. Gorbachev's meeting with French President F. Mitterrand in Kiev. There the heads of two great European powers approached the need for a broad meeting within the framework of the Helsinki process because of the fast-moving changes on the European continent. The French head of state unequivocally supported the idea of holding a summit meeting in 1990. At the same time its agenda began to take shape. It was recognized that the profound changes in Europe today have raised many problems, including questions of how to manage the instruments and structures formed earlier, at the first stage of the Helsinki process, and functioning now. There is also an urgent need to speak about the new structures and forms of cooperation which Europeans must achieve in the future.

In response to Washington's proposal to hold a summit meeting of the 23 countries a compromise proposal was made from the banks of the Dnepr: Why not make the signing of the treaty on the reduction of armed forces and of the agreements on confidence-building measures, which will be prepared in Vienna, a specific part of a meeting of 35 heads of state within the framework of Helsinki-2? "The holding of an all-European forum as early as 1990 is perfectly valid in such a situation of interdependence," France's L'HUMANITE pointed out.

A constructive approach seems to have been displayed in Washington, too, which has made a substantial correction to its position after familiarizing itself with the news from Kiev. At any rate, in an interview granted to THE WASHINGTON POST on the eve of his present West European tour J. Baker did not rule out "the possibility that Gorbachev's proposal to hold a new conference of 35 countries' leaders as early as next year will, in time, be adopted." Such a summit meeting "must not, in my opinion, be rejected," J. Baker continued. "But I believe that careful preparations must be made for it."

Who would object to such preparations if they benefit the development of the Helsinki process?

Commentary Views World Response

LD1112113189 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 9 Dec 89

[Excerpts] Mikhail Gorbachev's proposal put forward during his recent visit to Italy to convene an all-European top-level conference, Helsinki-2, has been met with broad response all over the world. Why is it so important to speed up the convocation of this all-European forum? Here's what Anatoliy Potapov writes in reply to this question:

An exchange of ideas, concepts, on overcoming Europe's split and promoting its unity is simply necessary. Let's recall that the all-European Helsinki conference rested on two underlying principles—security and cooperation. What is happening now? The level of military danger has been brought down and it keeps going down. The Soviet-U.S. meeting off Malta has given us solid hopes for a possible signing next year of agreements on the reduction of the armed forces and conventional weapons on the continuent, 50 percent cuts in strategic weapons, and elimination of chemical weapons. These are all the rejoicing signs. Yet attempts to redraw the postwar territorial map of Europe arouse much concern. The Bonn plan calling for a reunification of the two German states has caused different reactions in the circles of the West European politicians. Opinions are voiced that this plan may lead to a destabilization on the continent. In the new situation, the criteria of security and its further maintenance in Europe require an earliest consideration at a forum of all the 35 participants in the European security conference without exception.

Let's now look at the principle of cooperation. The pace of development of inter-European contact has lately

accelerated beyond any exception. [passage omitted] In reference to economic contacts, President Mitterrand of France proposed what he called as a European continental structure. I personally see no disagreement in it with the concept of a European home. Maybe in another form, but the idea was expressed once again about a future unified Europe. What is needed today are new mechanisms, new structures corresponding with the present day and future development of contacts.

There's one more point that should be stressed: Cooperation in the humanitarian field acquires a special role today. The conference on human dimension held in Paris put forward many new ideas. The exchange of opinions on them at the top level during Helsinki-2 will undoubtedly be useful for the attainment of tangible results of the future conferences on human dimension due to be held in Copenhagen and Moscow. Some Western politicians believe that a conference of 35 states at foreign minister level should be held prior to the Helsinki-2 conference. I find this idea sensible, writes Anatoliy Potapov. More than one meeting of experts will probably require as well. The main thing is that we are pressed by time. Events in Europe are developing very rapidly. History itself is propelling political leaders to activity. Today is the right time for concentrating all the ideas and political concepts for summing up and analyzing the experience of the past years in order to call new energy into being and give a fresh boost to the European process. All this can be done with the help of Helsinki-2 conference.

Pact General Staff Chiefs Meet in Moscow 11 Dec

LD1112162889 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1542 GMT 11 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, 11 Dec, (TASS)—Today in Moscow there was a meeting of the chiefs of General (Main) Staffs of the Warsaw Treaty member states' armed forces on questions of preparing for participation in the seminar on military doctrines which will take place from 16 January to 5 February in Vienna within the framework of the talks on measures for strengthening trust and security in Europe.

The meeting took place in constructive and comradely conditions.

United States & Canada

USSR-U.S. Consultative Commission Meeting Ends

LD1412100489 Moscow TASS in English 1422 GMT 13 Dec 89

[Text] Geneva December 13 TASS—A regular session of the Soviet-American permanent consultative commission has completed work here today. It was established in compliance with the memorandum of understanding between the Soviet and U.S. Governments of December 21, 1972.

Its aim is to promote the goals and provisions of agreements concluded between the two countries concerning the limitation of strategic weapons and measures to lessen the danger of a nuclear war.

The Soviet and U.S. representatives agreed to resume the work of the commission's next session in Geneva on April 4, 1990.

Commentator Praises Baker's European Tour

LD1412134689 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 13 Dec 89

[Viktor Glazunov commentary—read by announcer]

[Text] Baker's European tour rouses special interest, for it is associated with the attempt to chart the United States present-day policy in Europe. As Mr Baker himself has put it, it is important to envision Europe's future in the light of the changes taking place on the continent.

In my opinion, says Viktor Glazunov, the significant feature is that the American Administration proceeds from the assumption that Europe's future of peace should rest on the foundation of the European Helsinki conference and be built within the limits of the all-European process. This follows from statements made by James Baker and not only from statements alone. Western observers are commenting extensively now on the policy-making speech, as they put it, delivered by Mr Baker in West Berlin. This speech is worthy of the most serious analysis.

But even more sensational, in my opinion, says Viktor Glazunov, is the meeting between James Baker and the prime minister of the German Democratic Republic, Hans Modrow, in Potsdam. This is the first meeting held by the United States and the German Democratic Republic at such a high level. The fact that it took place at a time when certain circles in West Germany contemplate the [words indistinct] of the GDR makes this meeting even more meaningful, especially since in the course of it the American secretary of state voiced his country's support for the process of reforms in the GDR. Hans Modrow declared for his part that the just-opened dialogue would lead to cooperation.

Judging from reports, the question about the possible unification of the two German states was not raised in Potsdam. James Baker touched upon that subject in his speech in West Berlin. As it follows from it, the German question is not a purely German issue. There is also the responsibility of the four great powers, the winners in the war against Nazi Germany. There are also the interests of other countries and nations, and also the interests of European stability and security. James Baker spoke about a unification of Germany within the context of the all-European process. He warned against the rash handling of this issue, called for a cautious approach, and stressed the need for maintaining European stability.

The American secretary of state spoke at the same time about the need for reorienting the Atlantic policy in a certain way; he favored the revision of the NATO (?concept) in the light of the changes taking place in Eastern Europe, and the enhancement of Europe's political role, its participation in the development of economic and political contacts with the East.

I think, says Viktor Glazunov, that Baker's ideas echo with what Mikhail Gorbachev declared at the Moscow top-level meeting of the Warsaw Treaty Organization. Realism, Mikhail Gorbachev said, makes us proceed from the need to maintain in the foreseeable future the existing alliances: NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization. They can contribute to the strengthening of the European security and political alliances by becoming a bridge resting on the foundation of high joint responsibility. (?A realism) of stability in the conditions of changes, and a steady development of the Helsinki process seem to be the key foundations used for working out the consensus concerning the future of Europe, of a common European home.

Military Expert on Results of Malta Meeting

LD1412132889 Moscow TASS in English 1630 GMT 13 Dec 89

[All quotation marks as received]

[Text] Moscow December 13 TASS—By TASS Correspondent Mikhail Ivanov:

"A breakthrough", "a crucial event"—such enthusiastic definitions do not reveal the true importance of the Soviet-American summit off Malta," Sergei Blagovolin, chief of the Military-Economic and Military-Political Research Department of the Soviet Institute of World Economy and International Relations, told TASS.

"The Gorbachev-Bush meeting in the Mediterranean," he said, focused on all the problemns concerning the further development of Soviet-American relations. They were discussed in a calm and businesslike atmosphere. Such summit meetings will become increasingly regular and even commonplace, and that's historically important."

Another distinguishing feature of the Malta meeting, Blagovolin believes, was that "both sides were ready to admit openly and calmly the remaining differences, including on the problems of regional conflicts."

Touching on prospects for the conclusion of an agreement to cut strategic offensive weapons by per cent [no number as received], the Soviet expert stressed that the goal set by the Soviet and American presidents—to reach agreement on the treaty's principal provisions by the second half of June—were perfectly feasible.

"Of course," he added, "there are still several unresolved problems, primarily the air and sea-based cruise missiles issue. However, the Mediterranean meeting has shown that there is political will to conclude the agreement, and this will is much stronger at the summit than at "bureaucratic" level. This is why it is good that the work of experts is under permanent top-level supervision," the scientist said.

"The overall positive tone of the Soviet-American dialogue signifies that many problems, disturbing both sides, will be settled as bilateral relations develop," Blagovolin stressed.

U.S. To Build 'Star Wars' Station in Portugal

LD1412134489 Moscow World Service in English 2100 GMT 12 Dec 89

[Viktor Cherevskiy commentary]

[Excerpts] The Portuguese Supreme Defense Council has approved the Portuguese-U.S. agreement to build a U.S. satellite tracking station, which is expected to be an important link in the Pentagon's Star Wars program, in Almodovar. This is what our collaborator, Viktor Cherevskiy, writes.

In my opinion this is not so much a matter of expanding the U.S. military presence in Portugal—although this is likely—but a further step toward the country's militarization. Allowing its territory to be used for foreign military installations is in itself complicity in the military activities of the partner. Besides this, a solid chunk of the payment for the use of Portuguese territory for U.S. bases is, as is known, used for military purposes, to purchase increasingly new weapons. We know that the expansion of the U.S. military presence in Portugal and the enormous expenditure on arms is all under the pretext that Portugal must play a more important role in Western defense strategy and, thus, to gain prestige. [passage omitted]

I am not sure that the Portuguese are pleased that their small country could play a strategic role in NATO's military projects, particularly since militarization is a costly activity devouring enormous resources from the budget. [passage omitted]

As for the United States, its position is very logical. It is interested in the money spent on the Lajes base not being lost, but getting it back as payment for weapons which are often obsolete. We think that transactions such as these are also advantageous to the Americans, because Portugal is tied to bilateral accords. Thus, the Americans guarantee their continued stay in Portugal.

As we have already said, the very presence of U.S. military installations on Portuguese territory in itself means the country's militarization. How can this be understood? Foreign bases are dangerous and perfidious, Viktor Cherevskiy thinks. A country which has foreign bases in its territory automatically becomes an accomplice in any military action undertaken by its partner. It is natural that the third party falling victim to this action has the right to launch a counterattack. This is a fact. It is not coincidental that today many countries are trying to get rid of all foreign bases. One does not have to look far for examples. We can take the example of neighboring Spain.

As for the Almodovar satellite tracking station, in sanctioning its building, Portugal takes on a considerable responsibility, since this station is directly connected to Star Wars. As is known, the aforementioned program is condemned by public opinion in many countries. Thus, it seems to me that the present decision will not enhance Portugal's prestige in the international arena.

Supreme Soviet Delegation's U.S. Trip Summarized

PM1112105189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Unattributed report: "Soviet Parliamentarians in the United States"]

[Text] A USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by F.M. Burlatskiy, chairman of the Subcommittee for Humanitarian, Scientific, and Cultural Ties under the International Affairs Committee, visited the United States 25 November through 5 December 1989 at the invitation of D. DeConcini, chairman of the Commission for Security and Cooperation in Europe, and S. Hoyer, cochairman of this commission.

The delegation had extensive discussions in Washington with a wide circle of representatives of the legislative, judicial, and executive authorities. The deputies met with leaders of the House of Representatives and the Senate and also participated in commission hearings. Members of the commission welcomed F.M. Burlatskiy's explanations regarding draft laws under discussion in the Supreme Soviet on questions such as entry to and exit from the USSR, freedom of conscience and the activity of religious organizations, the press and the mass media, social organizations, legal guarantees of human rights, and also the upcoming major constitutional reforms in the USSR.

During the delegation's stay in Washington there was an extensive discussion of various questions concerning Soviet-U.S. relations. Particular attention was paid to human rights and the implementation of nationalities legislation in accordance with international obligations within the framework of the Helsinki process. Members of the commission and members of Congress discussed in detail the events taking place in the Soviet Union, particularly the process of perestroyka, democratization of society, and reforms in the sphere of human rights. A

significant part of the discussion was devoted to the USSR Supreme Soviet's work.

Particular attention was paid to the Malta meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush. The sides welcomed the positive tone of these talks.

The Soviet and U.S. sides noted the growing role and importance of humanitarian problems in the current dialogue between the USSR and the United States.

The Soviet delegation invited the commission to visit the Soviet Union in 1990 to continue discussing human rights problems and related questions within the framework of the all-European process and to participate in joint hearings on the question of the two sides' fulfillment of the provisions of the Vienna agreements and other CSCE documents.

U.S. Official Received at Foreign Ministry

LD1212191889 Moscow TASS in English 1623 GMT 12 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 12 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Valentin Nikiforov today received Edward Perkins, director general of the Diplomatic Service of the U.S. Department of State. The two men discussed training of experts on international issues.

The meeting was attended by member of the Soviet Foreign Ministry Collegium Vladislav Terekhov and minister-counsellor of the U.S. Embassy in Moscow John Joyce.

U.S. Experts End Work at Rovno Nuclear Plant

LD1112095889 Moscow TASS in English 2107 GMT 10 Dec 89

[Text] Kiev December 10 TASS—By TASS Correspondent Viktor Mazaniy:

A group of specialists from the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission ended today its work at the Rovno Atomic Power Station in the Ukraine.

The American specialists visited the station within the frame of the work of the joint Soviet-American Coordinating Commission for Civil Nuclear Reactor Safety set up last year.

They talked with Soviet colleagues and examined documents to make clear how the station was operated to secure the safety of the personnel and the station itself.

"During the talks we simulated various situations and compared what Soviet colleagues did with what we would do in the situation," Asok Chatani, director of the Commission's design department told TASS.

"It is good that we are concerned over the same problems. We wish this cooperation had been established earlier—it would have done good to all.

"Soviet and American nuclear units differ in design but we share the same philosophy of safety. This is why we need a broad-based honest dialogue now.

"The safety of atomic power stations must be secured by joint effort if we want nuclear power engineering to have a future".

Over the period of existence of the Soviet-American Coordinating Commission for Civil Nuclear Reactor Safety, its members have made a preliminary analysis of safety of the power units at the Rovno atomic power station and a nuclear power plant in Texas and compiled normative documents on safety control during the operation of atomic power stations.

The beginning has been set to joint work on investigating grave accidents.

U.S. Agriculture Official Received in Moscow

PM1412110789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Dec 89 Moscow Evening Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 8 December V.V. Nikitin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received R. Crowder, U.S. under secretary of agriculture.

China

CPSU Delegation To Visit Beijing 23 Dec

HK1512043289 Hong Kong AFP in English 0412 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] Beijing, Dec 15 (AFP)—A high-level Soviet Communist Party delegation is to come to Beijing next weekend and will discuss Eastern Europe with Chinese officials, a Soviet diplomatic source Friday said.

The group, led by Valentin Falin, head of the International Department of the Soviet Communist Party's Central Committee, is expected to arrive December 23, the source said.

It follows a similar visit to Moscow by a Chinese Communist Party Central Committee delegation in September, he said.

China and the Soviet Union formally ended a 30-year split during President Mikhail Gorbachev's summit visit to Beijing in May, at the height of student-led democracy protests in Tiananmen Square.

Mr. Falin's agenda is being drawn up by the Chinese side, but fast-changing events in Eastern Europe would "of course" be taken up, the Soviet source said.

Mr. Falin was for 16 years the Kremlin's ambassador to Bonn.

The source dismissed suggestions that Mr. Falin's trip was a follow-up to last weekend's surprise visit to Beijing by U.S. President George Bush's national security adviser, Brent Scowcroft.

Mr. Scowcroft came to Beijing to brief Chinese leaders on the recent Bush-Gorbachev summit in Malta and to discuss ways of restoring Sino-U.S. relations after the bloody June 4 quelling of pro-democracy protests.

Moscow has already briefed Beijing on the Malta summit through usual bilateral diplomatic channels, the Soviet source said.

China has said little about the dramatic changes in Eastern Europe, at a time when resurgent hardliners in the Chinese Communist Party have been reasserting orthodox Marxist principles.

But in a press briefing Thursday, Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman Jin Guihua referred implicitly to Eastern Europe by saying that the international situation was "undergoing the most profound changes since World War Two."

CPSU's Falin Briefs Chinese Ambassador

PM1412132789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Dec 89 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 12 December V.M. Falin, member of the CPSU Central Committee and chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, received Yu Hongliang, PRC ambassador to the USSR. The ambassador was briefed on certain topical questions of the CPSU's domestic and foreign policy. There was also an exchange of opinions on the further development of ties between the CPSU and the CPC.

CPSU Official Views Relations With CPC

OW1312214189 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0600 GMT 6 Dec 89

[From the "Hello, China" program]

[Text] Listeners, the year 1989 is about to pass. It is a special year as far as Soviet-Chinese relations is concerned. As everyone knows, relations between the Soviet Union and China have been completely normalized following Soviet leader Gorbachev's visit to Beijing last May. Meanwhile, the CPSU and the CPC have also resumed normal relations. How is the development of relations between the Soviet and Chinese parties at this time? Our reporter (Bolizablamov) asked (Tavlovskiy), a responsible cadre of the CPSU Central Committee, to answer this question. The following is his remark:

[(Tavlovskiy) heard speaking briefly in Russian, fading into announcer's translation] He said: The meeting between Gorbachev and Deng Xiaoping in Beijing marked the normalization of relations between the Soviet and Chinese parties. Since that meeting, a lot of work has been done to develop the relations between the CPSU and CPC. Not long ago, a delegation from the CPC Central Committee led by the head of its International Liaison Department, Zhu Liang, visited Moscow. A CPSU cadre delegation will soon visit China. The CPSU Central Committee has opened its door to Chinese journalists and diplomats after a long period of suspension of such opening. We are greatly delighted that we have conducted free exchange of opinions in an unofficial way.

(Tavlovskiy) continued: Our starting point from the very beginning is that relations between the two parties are not the main aspect of the development of Soviet-Chinese relations. In his talks with Chinese leaders last May, Gorbachev emphatically pointed out this principle. At that time in Beijing, he particularly stressed that in line with the new thinking, the Soviet Union, in its foreign policy, is upholding the principle of no ideological consideration in dealing with country-to-country relations, a principle that has been constantly followed. As we clearly recall, the tension that appeared 30 years ago in Soviet-Chinese relations actually started from ideological differences and ideological debates. We do not want to take that same path again. At the present new historical stage, we should develop relations between the CPSU and the CPC on a realistically equal basis and under the condition that neither imposes its own view upon the other. I wish to stress once again that on the basis of equality and mutual benefit, we are exchanging views and swapping experience in party work under the condition of reform. Now, a characteristic of our relations is that one side unconditionally respects the stand of the other side. This is the reliable basis for the stable development of the two countries and the two parties of the Soviet Union and China, concluded (Tavlovskiy), responsible cadre of the CPSU Central Committee.

Li Peng Denies PRC Reform 'Regressing'

PM1412152189 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 14 Dec 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "PRC: To Free the People's Initiative"]

[Text] At a meeting with the participants in an international symposium being held in Beijing on questions of reform and the policy of openness to the outside world Li Peng, premier of the PRC State Council, described the special features of the Chinese reform at the contemporary stage.

He said that the purpose of the current political transformations in the country is to maximally mobilize the people's initiative so that "the masses can serve the cause of the four modernizations with all their heart and in all their thoughts." The changes in the political sphere are designed to promote China's stability and prosperity, not to serve as grounds for the emergence of public disorders, he emphasized.

The head of the Chinese Government pointed to appreciable results in the matter of instilling order in the country's economy.

The family contract in the countryside, the contract system and the system of responsibility of enterprise directors, the system of financial responsibility of the center and the districts, private enterprise, special economic zones, maritime regions, and the preferential policy with regard to foreign investors—all this, the premier declared, will remain unchanged and make it possible to maintain continuity and stability in realizing the policy of reforms and openness to the outside world.

As previously, China's national economy continues to combine a planned economy with market regulation. "It is wrong to think," Li Peng said, "that the reduction in the share of the market economy, which has happened recently, means the reform is regressing."

Northeast Asia

Mutual Concessions Urged in DPRK-ROK Talks

SK1512082689 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 14 Dec 89

[From the program "Focus on Asia"]

[Text] Our station commentator (I. Petrov) speaks about how the Korean question is viewed in Moscow:

The answer to this question can be found in Comrade Gorbachev's remarks made at his recent Malta meeting with U.S. President Bush. The Soviet leader stressed that sensitive issues should be settled through political means. The U.S. president agreed and this is important.

Today, we are in a quest for the specific means to settle disputes. As shown by the experiences of the past, the Korean question, too, must be settled in a political way. Neither the North nor the South benefit from the tension on the Korean peninsula. From this, we can (?derive a clear answer) that the way to improve the Korean situation should be sought with patience and persistence. Both Pyongyang and Seoul have put forth many rational proposals for settling the Korean question. We will briefly recall them:

The DPRK has called for the reduction of the armed forces of the North and South, the withdrawal of nuclear weapons and U.S. troops from South Korea, the turning of the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free zone, and the cessation of military exercises in Korea and in its surrounding areas. South Korea, too, has taken comprehensive steps to develop wide-ranging cooperation between the North and South. It has also declared that it would not use force first against the DPRK. Regrettably, the North-South dialogue, which is being held in an abnormal way, has not produced visible results yet.

The fact that the two sides are willing to discuss the reunion of the separated families, the question of the North-South parliamentary talks, and the question of (?contacts in other areas) can be noted. But what is important is that talks should be held (?to produce results). The settlement of the Korean question should be sought in a (?comradely manner). This is possible because the two sides have already expressed their desire to seek a compromise settlement. Without mutual concessions, progress is impossible in the North-South dialogue. The Soviet Union supports the peaceful and democratic settlement of regional disputes. This is absolutely applicable in regard to the Soviet stand toward the Korean question as well.

It is clear that the Korean people themselves should settle the question of national reunification. At present, the Soviet Union is making all possible efforts to end the confrontation on the Korean peninsula and to improve the political situation there. The Soviet proposal for discussing the question of (?reducing the level of deployment in the areas along the coasts of) the Soviet Union, China, Japan, North Korea [pukchoson], and South Korea [namjoson] is precisely a part of such an endeavor. The direct Soviet-ROK cooperation in the (?construction area) and the establishment of their relations in the scientific, technological, cultural, and sports fields have become a new opportunity to improve the situation on the Korean peninsula.

The Soviet Union and the ROK have agreed on (?opening their consular departments) at the trade missions in Moscow and Seoul. This is undoubtedly a step forward on the road to establishing complete consular relations between the two countries. It is clear that the development of the Soviet-ROK relations, along with the consolidation of the cooperation between the Soviet Union and the DPRK, is positively influencing the Korean situation and the development of the overall situation in Northeast Asia. This is the way the peaceful settlement of the Korean question is viewed in Moscow.

We note that the Soviet Union is willing to seriously consider all the proposals other countries have put forth in the interest of peacefully settling the complicated Korean question.

Future of PRC-ROK Ties Described

SK1512065789 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 14 Dec 89

[From the program "Asian News"]

[Text] According to KYODO, the PRC and ROK will begin talks in March 1990 to (?adjust nongovernmental working-level relations) and establish limited diplomatic relations. China and the ROK have agreed on opening their trade missions respectively in Beijing and Seoul. China has become the ROK's fourth largest trade partner.

Nature of USSR-ROK Consular Ties Discussed

SK1412134289 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 13 Dec 89

[From "Asian News" program]

[Text] REUTER, citing the statement of the spokesperson for the ROK Foreign Ministry, reported that the Soviet Union and the ROK would exchange diplomats.

They will respectively work at the consular departments in Moscow and Seoul according to the agreement signed in Singapore on 17 November.

The consular departments will open at the trade missions of the two countries. Thus, they would not be like consular offices that are established according to international law. Flags would not be hung outside.

USSR-South Korea Begin Academic Exchange

90UI0193A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 49, 9-15 Dec 89 p 7

[Text] A signing ceremony for an agreement on cooperation between Moscow State University (MGU) and South Korea's biggest private university, Yonse, has been held at the M.V. Lomonosov Moscow State University. Yonse University represents a conglomerate of 17 colleges and 68 faculties, which have 30,000 students.

The agreement between MGU and Yonse is the first between Soviet and South Korean educational institutions. It provides for joint research in various branches of learning, scientific conferences, an exchange of information and literature, and finally an exchange of students and lecturers. The exchange quota is negligible as yet. However, if the initial experiment is successful, relations may be expanded appreciably in a year.

This event is not an isolated instance characterizing the Soviet Union's new approaches to relations with countries of the Asia-Pacific region. The policy of trade and economic and cultural relations with South Korea in development of the initiatives advanced by M.S. Gorbachev in Krasnoyarsk in September 1988 is contributing to the establishment of bilateral contacts between the representatives of the two countries' scientific, public, and business circles.

In our view this process is objective inasmuch as a situation can hardly be considered normal where we in the USSR have pretended for more than 40 years that there was nothing but a "blank" on the Korean peninsula south of the 38th parallel.

USSR Wants Fishing Off Kuril Islands Banned

OW1312062789 Tokyo KYODO in English 0541 GMT 13 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, Dec. 12 KYODO—The Soviet Union is seeking to ban Japanese fishing in part of the Pacific off the Kuril Islands, Japanese Government officials said Tuesday.

The Soviets made the request in bilateral fishery talks being held in Moscow.

The talks cover catch quotas and other terms of Japanese and Soviet fishing in each other's 200-mile fishing zone.

The Soviet request for a ban in part of its 200-mile zone is the first of its kind, according to the officials.

Japan will be forced to take a similar stance toward Soviet fishing in its 200-mile zone if the Soviets keep their position, they said.

Soviet negotiators said they are seeking the ban due to a scant domestic food supply an poor marine resources in the Bering Sea, which are forcing Soviet ships to go south for catches, the officials said. The Soviets also are calling for a ban on Japan's placement of trawl nets in the Soviet area of the sea off the Kuril Islands.

The Soviet demands, which Japan opposed as jeopardizing Japanese trawl fishing, have deadlocked the talks, they said.

Japan has sought 210,000 metric tons in its catch quota in the Soviet zone for 1990, the same amount as in 1989. Soviet officials have proposed 182,000 tons. Japan is asking for an additional 100,000 tons as a quota for paid fishing against the Soviet proposal of 65,000 tons.

Japanese Firm Buys Soviet Orbital Station

LD1412210289 Moscow World Service in English 0710 GMT 14 Dec 89

[Excerpts] Reports from Tokyo say the Japanese firm of (Hori Group) have bought a Soviet-built orbital station, and here are more details about the purchase.

The (?acquired) station is similar to the Mir space station that has been in terrestrial orbit since its launch in February of 1986. [passage omitted] The (Hori Group) president, (Itaka Hori) has said that he bought the Soviet orbital station and accompanying Kvant module at the World Design Expo in Nagoya where they were exibited recently,. When Mr (Hori) explained what was behind the decision to purchase the facilities, he said that the Soviet Union offered space technology on a commercial basis (?and) the firm accepted that because Japan was far behind the United States and the USSR in space technology. He voiced hope that the Soviet station would help Japan to promote its program of piloted flights. [passage omitted]

Mongolian Foreign Minister Plans USSR Visit

PM1412132389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Dec 89 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Forthcoming Visit"]

[Text] Mongolian Foreign Minister Tserenpiliin Gombosuren will pay a working visit to the Soviet Union in the second half December 1989 at the Soviet Government's invitation.

Mongolian Complaints at Slow Reform Noted

PM1412153189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 8

[Own correspondent A. Nabatchikov dispatch: "Society Dissatisfied"]

[Text] Ulaanbaatar—A Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party [MPRP] Central Committee plenum has been held in the Mongolian capital. It was broadcast live on radio and TV for the first time. The plenum's agenda included topical problems of the renewal process begun in the republic exactly 3 years ago as well as organizational questions.

The first sanctioned mass rally of the Mongolian Democratic Union [MDU]—a new voluntary social organization uniting mainly representatives of the intelligentsia and young students—was held literally on the eve of the plenum. At the rally the MDU's program, which it is planned to ratify in the very near future at the organization's constituent conference, was read out. The MDU demands, in particular, that a law on parties be adopted, that a fundamental reform of the electoral system be carried out, and that early elections to the People's Great Hural be held.

This was the first time that dissatisfaction with the progress and pace of perestroyka in Mongolia had been expressed here in so sharp a form as a rally. A similar reaction is basically typical of the extensive discussion launched both at the MPRP Central Committee plenum and during the preparations for it in the mass media. The assessments—sometimes categorically sharp and diametrically opposed—submitted for the public's consideration reaffirm again and again just what an important qualitative improvement has taken place over the past year in national self-awareness and in the struggle between the new on the one hand, and the old, conservative, and stagnant past on the other.

According to one of the most widespread opinions, perestroyka in Mongolia is only taking its first steps and should comprise phased and consecutive measures. At the same time, it is noted that, although it has won the general public's support and approval, perestroyka has not yet become irreversible—which makes Mongolia different from a number of other socialist countries.

A number of people, Comrade J. Batmonh's report at the plenum stated, are dissatisfied with the current results of perestroyka, only know about its processes by hearsay, have not gone into them in depth, and are therefore unprepared to personally participate in them.

The economy is unbalanced. The gap between production and consumption and between imports and exports is covered by credit aid from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. There are currently disruptions in the supply of many kinds of goods such as tea, candles, washing powder, and others.

On the basis of a frank analysis we can conclude that Mongolia has not yet taken a decisive step in the direction of breaking with this kind of bureaucratic "credit" socialism. The bureaucratic administrative-edict apparatus, which has taken deep root in society's socioeconomic life, is the main brake on perestroyka.

It is no longer any secret, the newspaper UNEN comments, that we are living in an interdependent world, and the dynamic processes taking place in the socialist countries—the processes of the rebirth of the genuine values of the socialist system—should apply fully to our country, too, primarily its leadership.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

U.S. Role in Philippines Rebellion Viewed

PM1412103389 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Dec 89 Single Edition p 3

[Colonel S. Sokolovskiy article under the rubric "International Notes": "Who Needed the Conspiracy?"]

[Text] On 1 December Phantom F-4 aircraft took off from the U.S. Clark Field base in the Philippines and headed for airfields seized by participants in the antigovernment rebellion. At the same time the U.S. Armed Forces command in the Philippines warned the rebels that if their aircraft took off, the U.S. pilots would attack them. The rapid and resolute U.S. actions were a significant help to Philippine Government forces in successfully suppressing the rebellion and restoring control over the country and the capital.

This action surprised many observers. Primarily by the speed with which the White House made the decision on military intervention in another country's internal affairs. But should one be surprised at this U.S. reaction to the Philippine Government's request for assistance in suppressing the rebels? After all, it is not difficult to explain Washington's actions.

First and foremost, there is the fact that talks are to be held in the near future about the U.S. military facilities in that country. As is known, even after the expiry of the present bases agreement in 1991 Washington hopes to keep the Clark Air Base and Subic Bay Naval Base—its biggest military facilities outside the continental United States. The Pentagon believes that they are vital to ensure control over shipping in the South China Sea and the channels between the Pacific and Indian Oceans. According to assessments by one of the conservative think tanks—the "Heritage Foundation"—the Pentagon's loss of "its military bases in the Philippines would be an even bigger setback than the defeat in Vietnam."

In order to maintain its military presence, the United States is trying to take advantage of the Philippines' difficult position (its foreign debt exceeds $29 billion). It is promising to substantially increase the amount of financial compensation to C. Aquino's government for the bases (from $180 million per annum in 1985-1989 to

$481 million per annum in 1990-1991). The United States also initiated a program of multilateral economic aid to the Philippines, which specifies involving 17 Western countries in giving Manila $10 billion in the next 5 years.

But economic aid and the stepped-up contacts between the two countries' top leadership have, according to assessments by U.S. politicians, still not provided guarantees that a new agreement on military bases will be signed. In order to achieve the immediate aims of U.S. military-political policy regarding the Philippines, Washington really needed a reason to clearly point out the Manila leadership's political dependence on the United States. And this chance presented itself when former Colonel Gregorio Honasan, at the head of a group of Philippine military personnel, attempted a coup.

THE NEW YORK TIMES reports that on 30 November, after the rebels bombed the presidential palace and other government facilities in Manila, the U.S. Administration received an official request from the Philippine Government to use the U.S. Armed Forces to stop the rebels' attempts to use military aircraft. Further actions developed rapidly.

Half an hour later U.S. Vice President D. Quayle held a meeting with prominent representatives of the administration and the armed forces to discuss a plan by General C. Powell, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, involving giving military support to C. Aquino's government. And an hour later President Bush, who was flying to Malta, approved the plan set out by D. Quayle. At the same time the decision was made to dispatch 100 Marines from the U.S. military bases in the Philippines to strengthen security at the U.S. Embassy in Manila and to make an urgent delivery of several hundred shoulder-fired antitank rocket launchers to troops loyal to C. Aquino's government.

The implementation of these measures enabled the Philippine Government to achieve a breakthrough in the situation in its favor. At the same time it is abundantly clear that this U.S. action significantly strengthened the U.S. positions in the forthcoming talks. Washington is convinced that these U.S. actions were a very convincing argument for C. Aquino's government in favor of continuing cooperation with the United States in the security sphere and of maintaining a U.S. military presence. Moreover, U.S. observers believe, a number of senators from the Philippine Congress realized that their personal well-being and their leading position in the country largely depend on the presence of the U.S. Armed Forces in the country.

In this connection some political figures are asking if the coup attempt in the Philippines was a consequence of the objective development of the sociopolitical processes in the country or the result of a secret operation by the U.S. special services? Thus, in conversation with journalists J. Naro, deputy speaker in the Indonesian parliament, stated that the military rebellion in the Philippines was inspired by the CIA with the aim of strengthening U.S. positions in the forthcoming talks on the future of the U.S. military bases.

This version cannot be ignored. Facts in recent times testify that Washington has not abandoned its policy of military intervention. Thus, at the beginning of October the U.S. Armed Forces command in the Central and South American region gave support to the Panamanian rebels, headed by Major Giraldi, who tried to overthrow the Noriega regime. It is striking that the directive to use U.S. Armed Forces in other countries was ratified then by the U.S. president, who stated directly that he does not object to "using force if it can be done sensibly." And that really makes you think.

New Zealand Foreign Minister Outlines Policies

PM1512094589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Interview with Russell Marshall, New Zealand foreign minister, by IZVESTIYA special correspondent V. Mikheyev: "Russell Marshall: Caricature-like Notions Are Receding Into the Past"—date of interview not given]

[Text] Wellington—[Mikheyev] Mr Minister, the New Zealand Government has recently demonstrated its readiness to "harmonize" its mutual relations with the United States, which, judging by press comments, may mean in the longer-term the restoration of full-fledged membership in the tripartite Australia-New Zealand-U.S. [ANZUS] defense pact. In this context your viewpoint about the division of the international landscape into military-political groupings is interesting. Does this kind of "bloc" mentality not hamper the growth of truly "united nations?"

[Marshall] I can only agree with you. However, the rigid model of the world which existed largely in our imagination is crumbling literally before our very eyes. In the past the world was strictly divided into "good guys" and "bad guys," and all the others were somewhere in the middle. However, our world never corresponded to such a simplistic model, and this is even more true today. I am convinced that the times are past when the bloc mentality prevailed, when everyone belonged to either one grouping or the other and consequently by virtue of this alone was opposed to others.

New Zealand cannot, single-handedly, establish a peace-loving mentality, but we have declared our unwillingness to see nuclear-powered or nuclear-equipped ships in our ports. This step was dictated by the mood of the public, by people of diverse political persuasions and different party allegiances, and therefore our government will never backtrack on this question.

[Mikheyev] How do you explain the popularity of this course?

[Marshall] There has been an appreciable thaw in the international climate in recent years: U.S. Presidents R. Reagan and G. Bush after him have met with President M. Gorbachev, the situation in Eastern Europe is changing, Soviet forces have been withdrawn from Afghanistan, the war between Iran and Iraq has ended, elections are in preparation in Namibia, and so forth. However, ecological problems remain. People are realizing that we live on a very fragile planet.

[Mikheyev] In this favorable climate, does New Zealand intend to try to strengthen regional stability, one of whose symbols was the Rarotonga Treaty on creating a nuclear-free zone in the southern Pacific?

[Marshall] We are actively involved in the disarmament process even though we do not officially participate in, for instance, the Geneva Disarmament Conference. One of our aims is the introduction of a universal and complete ban on nuclear weapon tests. We are trying to persuade the superpowers to sign the Rarotonga Treaty protocols. The Soviet Union and China have signed them, and I see no reason why the United States should not follow their example. Personally, I suspect that the United States is refusing to do so out of solidarity with the French, who are carrying out their tests in Polynesia. Great Britain, too, could follow suit by acceding to the Rarotonga Treaty.

Two years ago in Mexico, where the Tlaltelolco Treaty proclaiming Latin America a nuclear-free zone was born, my colleagues proposed building a bridge between the two regions which have rejected mass destruction weapons. They proposed that contacts be established between the two groups of states which have signed the Tlaltelolco and the Rarotonga Treaties.

[Mikheyev] States' interdependence is growing, and with it also understanding of the indispensability of cooperation in resolving what are described as global problems—hunger, epidemics, and ecological crises. In what spheres could the Soviet Union and New Zealand cooperate?

[Marshall] In the past the distance separating us was the decisive factor in New Zealanders' notions about your country. All this is changing. Confused and at times caricatured notions about the Soviet Union are receding into the past. Today the USSR represents an important market for us. Many people know this. As the Soviet Union becomes more and more accessible to us, the New Zealanders will be able to get to know your rich and varied history and your cultural traditions, and this will contribute to the establishment of cooperation.

[Mikheyev] In this context, could you describe the state of bilateral relations between the USSR and New Zealand?

[Marshall] Our relations are good. We follow M. Gorbachev's policy with sympathetic interest. Recently a parliamentary visit headed by the speaker has taken place. I am convinced that, if the question were asked in parliament as to who wanted to visit the USSR, everyone would raise their hand. Our contacts, not to mention our trade, are expanding.

[Mikheyev] And a last question. At present, as journalists put it, you are the "chief priest" of the New Zealand foreign policy. You were once a Methodist minister. And yet politics is frequently depicted as an occupation where there is no room for idealism...

[Marshall] In my opinion idealism, unless it is based on pragmatic considerations, is in a way immoral. I am frequently forced to argue with people, even friends, who believe that unless an ideal version of something can be achieved it is not even worth trying. I cannot agree with this. My experience tells me something different. It is much easier to criticize from the sidelines than to actually tackle a task, striving for progress, albeit modest, toward what is considered the ideal.

Near East & South Asia

Shevardnadze Receives Afghan Foreign Minister

LD1412195389 Moscow TASS in English 1920 GMT 14 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 14 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and his Afghan counterpart 'Abdul Wakil, passing through Moscow, today discussed the present state and prospects of further activity related to external aspects of the Afghan settlement.

The Afghan minister stressed that developments in Afghanistan following the withdrawal of Soviet troops showed that the government headed by President Najibullah not only upheld its positions, but also succeeded in consolidating them thanks to popular support.

The struggle against foreign interference is continuing successfully, he said. Many field commanders take the side of the government and protect villages and other populated localities situated in the zone of their operations. Faithful to its course towards a peaceful solution of the conflict, the government is expanding dialogue with other representatives of the opposition inside the country and abroad.

Shevardnadze informed the Afghan minister about the extensive discussion of the Afghan problem during the Soviet-American meeting in Malta and a meeting with former Afghan King Muhammad Zahir Shah in Rome.

Wakil thanked the Soviet Union on behalf of the Afghan leadership for political, moral and other assistance at this crucial period in the life of the Afghan people.

Relocation of Afghan Refugees Termed 'Mistake'

NC1412182489 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1100 GMT 14 Dec 89

[Aleksandr Batyev commentary]

[Text] According to reports from Tehran, the Iranian Majlis has rejected a bill on the relocation of Afghan refugees in your country to special camps. We asked our commentator Aleksandr Batyev to comment on this report. The Afghan refugees in Iran have greater freedom of movement than the Afghan refugees in Pakistan. The reason for this is that in Iran the slogan of Islamic solidarity is widely resorted to. However some of the Majlis deputies now wish to (?change) their policy regarding the Afghan refugees. They are seeking some plausible reasons for this. They stress that relocation will make it easier to prevent bribery and corruption from becoming widespread in society. It will also keep the society's chastity and security intact and remove the refugees from the workforce. As far as the issues of bribery and corruption, as well as that of chastity, are concerned, we will understand the facts if we recall that the Afghan refugees are seen as having been involved in drug dealing.

In my opinion, the need to give the Afghan refugees the opportunity for accommodation in special camps was dictated by economic as well as financial reasons. The rehabilitation of Afghan refugees would prove very expensive for Tehran and would require a large sum of money at a time when Tehran has an urgent need for finances for its reconstruction. It is no mere coincidence that Tehran has embarked on an unprecedented measure and requested financial aid from the UN High Commissioner for Refugees.

However, it was also known earlier that most of the refugee groups were engaged in drug smuggling, and it may be said, regarding the expense of rehabilitating the Afghan refugees, that this task was relatively more difficult during wartime. Therefore the question arises, why has the question of special camps for the refugees been raised now?

In this regard it may be said that the situation in Afghanistan, which is Iran's neighbor, should also be taken into consideration. Earlier it was stated that the presence of Soviet soldiers prevented the return of refugees to their country. For nearly a year now, not one Soviet soldier has been present on Afghan soil. However, the refugees have shown that they are in no hurry to return to their homeland. They are now complaining about the instability of the situation in their country and wondering how long it is going to continue. In such circumstances, some of the Majlis deputies are seeking to remove at least some of the responsibility of the Afghan refugee presence in Iran. In any case, the relocation of the refugees would be a mistake. It is no surprise that the return of the Afghan refugees to their homeland would be the fundamental solution of the issue, and the Afghan leadership in Kabul has invited Tehran to agree to this proposal.

Iran's Midterm Elections Previewed

NC1412204189 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1100 GMT 14 Dec 89

[Yuriy Andreyev commentary from "On the Waves of Radio Moscow" feature—recorded]

[Text] Even though only a small number of seats is vacant, the current midterm Majlis elections are of great significance for Iran. It is sufficient to point out that these are the first parliamentary elections since Imam Khomeyni's death, and that the possibility that the outcome of these elections will have a determining impact on the Islamic Republic of Iran in the near future is considerable.

Currently, 43 people who have been permitted to participate in the elections are running for the nine seats.

The Interior Ministry's election committee registered all the candidates and carefully studied their competence. The committee pointed out that only the representatives of those parties the legality of which was officially recognized by the government could participate in the current midterm elections. Moreover, the Majlis decided that only those who have a specific level of education or who have completed a religious school can be candidates.

All these limitations very naturally also limited the number of people running in the elections, even though this did not reduce the extent of the election campaign. For example, in Tehran, 22 people are running for four Majlis seats. Many of these candidates are famous political figures, namely six former ministers of Mir Hoseyn Musavi's cabinet.

I think that there are at least two reasons for the vital nature of the current elections. First of all, the Tehran deputies have played an outstanding role in the Majlis ever since the first parliamentary elections in 1906 and there is no doubt that great attention is focused on them. Second, a noteworthy point is that the candidates for the new seats are people who—after the election of 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani to the post of president—were forced to resign from their posts.

Many observers point out that these personalities form an opposition camp vis-a-vis the current government and support a stricter Islamic line in domestic and foreign policies. Among the most influential candidates, we can list Akbar Mohtashemi, Behzad Nabavi, Akrami, and Sarhaddizadeh, who were former ministers. It is possible that the voters will cast their votes for Mrs Zahra Mostafavi, Imam Khomeyni's daughter. According to a foreign observer, she did not [word indistinct] a victory, but wants to [words indistinct] her father.

It is interesting to note that the number of Majlis candidates in the other constituencies is relatively smaller than the number of candidates from Tehran. For example, between three and five candidates have been

registered from Kerman, Kashan, Bandar-e Torkman, [name indistinct], and Karaj. The results of the elections are expected to be published on the afternoon of December 16.

Iranian Export of Fundamentalism Discussed

LD1412141189 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Arabic 1430 GMT 14 Dec 89

[Andrey Vasilyev commentary—read by announcer]

[Text] The Tehran newspaper KEYHAN has written that the only way to peace in the occupied territory is to intensify the armed struggle there. The newspaper also said that the political line pursued by the PLO deviates substantially from the desires of the Palestinian people, which are pursuing and supporting the uprising. Radio Peace and Progress commentator Andrey Vasilyev comments on this. He writes that the essence of the criticisms levelled at the PLO in the Iranian newspaper article is summed up in one paragraph, that is, that the organization is not taking the Palestinian people toward the fulfilment of their demand, and that it is impossible to achieve success through the means adopted by the Palestinian resistance.

Let us assume for a moment that that is correct. What is the road chosen by Tehran? Who should lead the Palestinians and by what means?

The Iranian method is not original. It is nothing but a repeat of the revolutionary events of 1979, that is, the development of the pressure of the force by the broad masses under the leadership of the religious leaders. Should we, theoretically, expect this development of events to take place in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip? I think it improbable. The principle of gambling with force is in itself (?inappropriate) to the specific conditions of the occupied territory. It is not coincidental that the leadership of the Palestinian resistance has categorically prohibited the use of weapons by the residents, for (?all that is needed is one or two cases of the use of force) and the occupiers would, without hesitation, paint the uprising in blood. Given that military force is on their side, it would be criminally irresponsible to increase the already great number of casualties suffered by the peace-loving residents.

The Islamic organizations indeed have increased their activities in the occupied territory in recent months. In the foremost of these is the Hamas [Islamic Resistance Movement] organization. However, it would be exaggerated to say that the religious leaders have assumed leadership of the resistance movement. The residents in the densely populated West Bank and Gaza Strip can hardly be compared to the millions of the masses who are among the poorest in Iranian society, who were fed up with the then Shah's arrogant endeavors to spread Western lifestyles in the country in disregard of centuries-old tradition.

Tehran's criticisms of the PLO are very much connected to the existence of strong PLO ties with Saudi Arabia. It is known that Saudi Arabia spends not inconsiderable sums on PLO activities and Tehran wants to portray the situation as if the leadership of the resistance movement has sold out for petrodollars and has forgotten the aspirations of its people.

Our commentator, Andrey Vasilyev, has written: I think the issue here is not connected with the PLO, but with the Tehran clerics' hatred of the ruling Saudi family, to put it succinctly. For many of the Iranian religious leaders would not be averse to teaching the ruling family how it should look after Islamic interests. Thus, the politically indoctrinated pilgrims stirred up trouble in Mecca in 1987, a matter that led to the death of several people. The Islamic revolution generally is among the preferred items for export from Tehran, and attempts to interfere in the affairs of the Arab countries through the fundamentalist organizations can be seen in Lebanon, Egypt, Algeria, and Tunisia. Until recently, the Palestinian resistance movement had gotten rid of (?the suspect pleasure) of dealing with the extremists who have given themselves the right to speak and act in the name of the Palestinian people. However, it is more correct to say that the Palestinians have sufficient strength and willingness—and will in the future as well—to organize their destiny in accordance with their own (?wishes).

U.S. Efforts for Bases in Sri Lanka Criticized

BK1512090989 Moscow International Service in Tamil 1400 GMT 13 Dec 89

[Ivan Andreyev commentary]

[Text] Our correspondent Ivan Andreyev writes about Sri Lanka-U.S. relations:

Two important aspects can be noticed in current global politics, particularly on the issue of making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace. The first is the efforts of the regional countries and the Soviet Union to declare the Indian Ocean a zone of peace and to remove foreign military bases from the Asia-Pacific region. The second is the policies adopted by the United States and its NATO allies. They are giving special attention toward increasing their military presence in the Indian Ocean.

According to Washington, this has been done to protect the geographic and political interests of the United States in the Asia-Pacific region. Therefore, it is but natural that the United States has been making frantic efforts to find new allies among the Asia-Pacific countries and to establish new bases for its military and naval forces. The U.S. military headquarters considers Sri Lanka as a fortification for entering the Indian Ocean zone. The position of this strategically important island has (?attracted) the United States as an important military base for its Navy and Air Force.

It should be understood that, unfortunately, economic, political, and financial constraints have made it possible

for the United States to influence the Sri Lankan Administration to a certain extent. Between 1980 and 1987 some bilateral agreements were signed for the construction of a relay center for the Voice of America, the modernization of the strategically important Trincomalee port, and the implementation of some other programs. All these have enabled U.S. naval ships to enter Sri Lankan ports on a permanent basis.

The 1987 events that led to the signing of the Indo-Sri Lanka accord and the dispatch of the Indian Peacekeeping Force [IPKF] to Sri Lanka temporarily halted the implementation of the above schemes. One can understand this. Earlier, the Americans had to take into consideration the sincere relations between India and Sri Lanka, but since 1987 India has become an important foreign partner of Sri Lanka. As far as the Indo-Sri Lanka relations are concerned, they significantly influenced Sri Lanka's foreign policy.

But in the past few months, some irritants have cropped up in the relations between India and Sri Lanka on the question of the presence of the IPKF. The situation worsened by July this year, creating tension in the bilateral relations. The United States immediately exploited this situation to serve its own selfish motives.

The U.S. official delegation that visited Colombo in 1987 held talks with the Sri Lankan leaders. The head of the delegation, T. Sheffield, gave an assurance for providing continuous and increased assistance to Sri Lanka. It is true that the U.S. assistance to Sri Lanka increased 30 percent in 1989 over the previous year. It has been planned to increase the grant of loans and rehabilitation assistance to $30.45 million in 1990. It is to be noted that this assistance will be in the form of export of food materials.

On his part, Sri Lankan Foreign Minister Ranjan Wijeratne guaranteed the U.S. ships entry into the Sri Lankan ports. As per his assurance, the agreement for the construction of the Voice of America relay station will be implemented. To balance things while guaranteeing the Americans, Wijeratne gave an assurance to adopt a moderate approach in solving vital international issues under the jurisdiction of the United Nations.

It is clear that, in the near future, the performance of the Americans in Sri Lanka will depend upon the condition of Indo-Sri Lanka relations and the situation in Sri Lanka. Past experience clearly shows that although the United States intentionally adopts a neutral stand on the Sri Lankan ethnic conflict and does not overtly extend support to any rival factions, it will use all methods to meet its selfish interests. There is no doubt about it. As far as its relations with its neighboring countries are concerned, this seems to be true.

Besides, some observers opine that the United States will expand its efforts to penetrate Sri Lanka's economic and political sectors. What are the overseas U.S. friends going to attribute to their assistance to Sri Lanka tomorrow? Will they will speak about abandoning military bases in Sri Lanka or foresaking a nonaligned policy?

Sub-Saharan Africa

Commentary on Kenya's Screening of Somalis

EA1312175389 Moscow International Service in Amharic 1530 GMT 7 Dec 89

[Text] Heated debate continues over the Kenyan Government's decision to screen all of the ethnic Somalis resident in Kenya. We present you with a commentary written by Georgiy Tashin.

According to a Kenyan Government statement, the step was aimed at curbing alien Somalis coming into Kenya illegally. Their influx into Kenya has increased criminal acts and illegal trade. Foreign observers have also expressed their views on the issue. The Nairobi-based AFP reporter, for example, said the Kenyan Somalis were supported by bandit groups plying along the Somali-Kenyan border. Some observers have linked this step with the recent Somali-Kenyan border conflict, which claimed many human lives.

It is well known that relations between Kenya and Somalia have been tense for a long time. Since the Kenyan-Somali agreement which was signed in 1984, the southern Somali Liberation Front, [as heard] which was supported by Mogadishu, immediately became outlaw groups, and its members were deployed in illegal trading and poaching. Hence it has been necessary to deploy substantial security forces to counter them up to now. The number of these bandits has increased due to Somalis entering Kenya illegally. Thus, the Kenyan Government should not be accused of oppressing and suppressing Somali residents in Kenya. There is currently a huge development project for the northeastern province of Kenya, which is mostly inhabited by Somalis. An additional budget has been allocated for the implementation of that development program.

There are 16 Somali MP's in the Kenyan parliament who will defend the interests of the Kenyan Somalis. There are many ethnic Somalis currently holding high military and civil administration posts in Kenya. Probably the decision to screen ethnic Somalis in Kenya brought about such a heated debate because of the issue.

According to journalists, some leaders of Somali organizations including the MP's, have supported the government decision. They claim that it is only through such screening that they can clear their names of the wholesale accusation of Somali banditry. Most of the popular and religious organizations have condemned this government screening, and have described it as abusing the rights of ethnic Somalis and as discriminatory. The secretary general of the Kenya Muslim Supreme Council, Ahmed Khalif, has labelled the exercise illegal and

unconstitutional. The representative of the Presbyterian Church of East Africa, Timothy Njoya, has also criticized it.

AFP said that this type of action was the outcome of the colonialist period of discrimination. Our commentator says: I can understand the steps taken by the Kenyan Government to curb banditry in the country and protect the security of its citizens, but the situation in Kenya needs great care, as when one considers the key nationalities question.

Ethiopia, TPLF Talks Termed 'No Small Step'

EA1312174789 Moscow International Service in Somali 1600 GMT 11 Dec 89

[Text] On 12 December the meetings between the Ethiopia Government and the Tigray People's Liberation Front [TPLF] will resume in Rome. The delegates will discuss ways of settling the conflicts in northern Ethiopia. Our commentator Aleksandr Mikhaylov says that the first meeting between the Ethiopian Government and the TPLF was for reaching a consensus in preliminary talks for full-scale peace negotiations

I very much hope that in their second meeting, which will take place in Rome and can be taken as an ordinary round in the unofficial talks, will bring about the essential understanding. However, the understanding is being delayed by the bitter and increasing fighting between the government forces and units of the TPLF.

Unlike the Eritrean People's Liberation Front, which stopped its military operations after establishing contacts with the government, the TPLF is continuing its offensive on the southern regions, towards the capital city of Ethiopia. The front now controls some parts of the Gonder and Welo Regions, in addition to Tigray Region.

The government delegates were preparing for the talks while the emergency imposed by the government was in force, so that Tigray units would be eliminated once and for all. Bearing this in mind, one can appreciate why Ashagre Yigletu, deputy prime minister of Ethiopia, said that the meeting would be a heated and difficult one.

The TPLF explained that it had the right to adopt a strong position in the talks since it was strong. It has been learned that the Ethiopian Government is planning to embark on a large-scale counteroffensive against the front's units not later than the next 2 or 3 months. This means that the period in which the two confronting sides can discuss anything is very short.

Commentators predict that this may influence the ordinary meetings, and will force the delegates to speed up discussion on matters concerning the conditions for an agreement. Can they reach an agreement? Our commentator said: I do not think this question can be answered now, since their positions are very different. As well as calling for more autonomy for all the nationalities in Ethiopia, the TPLF also calls upon the government to hold new parliamentary elections, which is equivalent to the resignation of the recently-formed Ethiopian Government.

I think, our commentator added, [words indistinct] Addis Ababa's idea, that the opposition movements do not represent the interests of all the peoples living in that country, since each of them is backed by only one nationality. Tribalism is very dangerous, and Ethiopia may turn into a second Lebanon. Addis Ababa's stand on the TPLF and the other opposition organizations, whom it describes as mere tribalists, and its refusal to allow all the nationalities living in that country more autonomy are causing great delays in achieving consensus decisions. The high-level talks to be opened in Rome tomorrow prove that the two opposing sides long for meaningful talks, and this is no small step.

Horn of Africa Nations Urged to Seek Peace

EA1312172989 Moscow International Service in Amharic 1530 GMT 8 Dec 89

[Aleksandr Mikhaylov commentary]

[Text] Deputy Prime Minister Ashagre Yigletu has stated that the Ethiopian Government is ready to hold peace talks with the Tigray People's Liberation Front [TPLF] opposition group within 2 months. The Sudanese military leader, General 'Umar al-Bashir, has confirmed that the conflict in southern Sudan cannot be resolved militarily. He said this in Khartoum after the breakdown of the official peace talks in Nairobi between the Sudanese People's Liberation Army [SPLA] and the Sudanese Government.

We received these two news items at the same time. There is a similarity between them. They illustrate the difficult situation in the countries of the Horn of Africa. The situation in the region is worse than ever before. Armed opposition groups opposing the Addis Ababa government are heading for the capital city from both north and south. The Somali National Movement has occupied the town of Hargeysa and the situation there is tense. Hargeysa, the biggest town in northern Somalia, was the only town under the control of the Mogadishu government.

Sudanese Government forces say they have retaken the town of Kurmuk from the opposition SPLA for the third time. According to representatives of the freedom fighters, this is only a temporary military victory—that is, for the Khartoum government.

The only island of stability in the storm raging in the Horn of Africa is Kenya, which is crowded with refugees. By the way, this is the only country in East Africa—that is, the Horn of Africa, ruled by a civilian government.

The situation in Somalia, Sudan, and Ethiopia is worse than ever before because those in power are military leaders. In other words, their leadership has exacerbated

the already existing problems. Many analysts are thinking seriously about these issues. The outlook of the three military regimes—that is, Somalia, Ethiopia, and Sudan—is similar. It is based on archaic thinking: If you want peace, be ready for war.

On the eve of the talks with the SPLA, the Sudanese Government established five military divisions that will be armed with modern weapons acquired from foreign sources. According to the Khartoum government, the Army divisions will quickly destroy the rebels.

At the same time and in a similar manner, the Ethiopian Government, while holding peace talks with the Eritrean People's Liberation Front and TPLF, simultaneously called for nationwide mobilization, and now it is trumpeting that it will defeat the northern secessionists once and for all. It has become difficult to supply food to drought victims in the war-torn northern regions.

The Sudan has banned from its airspace planes carrying food aid from Uganda and Kenya to drought victims in southern Sudan. Contrary to claims by Ethiopian Government officials, international organizations have repeatedly affirmed that there are numerous famine victims in the country. All these situations, from left and right, only help to aggravate the situation further.

What is very saddening is that the leaders of the countries in the Horn of Africa are slow to understand how important peace is to everything. The peace issue is gaining much support from opposition parties. The recent peace talks confirm this. We hope that the leaders of the countries in the Horn of Africa will endeavor to overcome their military and political crises.

UN Best Hope To Solve Conflicts

EA1412142189 Moscow International Service in Somali 1600 GMT 12 Dec 89

[Text] Events in the Horn of Africa can be viewed from various angles and it appears that the future of the countries in the Horn of Africa is bright, and yet it could be dim. Our correspondent Aleksandr Mikhaylov says: A meeting between Somalia, Ethiopia, and the UN is taking place in Addis Ababa, on how Ethiopian refugees in Somalia may return home. The committee which organized the meeting symbolizes the improving relations between Somalia and Ethiopia. Following 10 years of cold war in the wake of the Ogaden war, the two African countries resumed normal diplomatic ties and opened talks on promoting mutually beneficial trade and economic cooperation. This means sharp differences can be solved peacefully.

However, the work of the committee can be viewed from a different angle. Somalia, which has accommodated refugees for a long time, is no longer in a position to do so, because international relief agencies have been compelled to drastically reduce the assistance they used to provide, as a result of the civil war raging in Somalia. It may be possible for the government to visit most regions. But can it guarantee the safety of workers from international aid agencies ? It has now been acknowledged that Ethiopian refugees are being recruited to fight in the civil war raging in Somalia. However, returnees to the motherland unfortunately face an unstable life. In Ethiopia civil war involving various factions and the government is spreading. The Eritrean People's Liberation Front [EPLF] is currently engaged in heavy fighting with government forces, and the government is recruiting all those capable of carrying guns to fight against the rebels. It is planning to launch a major offensive against the rebels in 3 months' time.

There is no evidence that relations between Ethiopia and Sudan are improving. Sudan has bitterly criticized relations between the People's Democratic Republic of Ethiopia [PDRE] and Israel. Future Sudan-PDRE relations will depend on the outcome of the PDRE, EPLF, and Tigray People's Liberation Front [TPLF] peace talks. The peace talks between those movements and the government could produce tangible results, particularly the PDRE-EPLF peace talks. Currently PDRE and the TPLF are also engaged in peace talks in Rome. It is not possible at the moment to comment on the Rome peace talks, because the main and most important issue of the cease-fire is being tackled now.

The views of the two sides' delegates are quite different. We can take Sudan as an example. When the issue of a cease-fire was raised, the Sudanese peace talks ended in deadlock. The commentator says: In my opinion, the best hope for the Horn of Africa lies with the UN call for peace among all the warring factions. Similar expressions are shared by the U.S., the USSR, and many African and Western countries. However, it is up to the people of those regions where conflicts exist to end the conflicts, for it is in their interests. It is necessary to end injustice and introduce democracy, rather than secession.

East Europe

Yakovlev Leaves Moscow for E. Berlin

LD1412160589 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1513 GMT 14 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, 14 Dec (TASS)—At the invitation of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany leadership, Aleksandr Yakovlev, Politburo member and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, today left Moscow for Berlin.

Discusses Ties With SED'S Gysi

LD1512091289 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 0106 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] Berlin (ADN)—The present situation within the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] and the CPSU, and the processes of reshaping, democratization, and renewal of socialism in the GDR and the USSR, were the subject of a very open exchange of views during a

meeting between SED Chairman Dr Gregor Gysi and Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Deputy SED Chairman Wolfgang Berghofer and SED Executive member Hans-Jochen Willerding were also present during the 4-hour talk yesterday evening in Berlin's Gaestehaus an der Spree. On the Soviet side Ambassador Vyacheslav Kochemasov was present.

Dr Gysi made a critical analysis of the causes for the development of the present crisis in the party and in society. At the same time, he elucidated focal points for the future activity of the renewed party on the path to democratic socialism. As ADN learned later, the development of relations between the two parties and countries was assessed critically, in all openness. Thoughts on the correction of the mistakes which had been made, and new fields and possibilities were also discussed in this connection.

Aleksandr Yakovlev, who outlined the experiences of his party in the political and economic reform in the USSR, referred in particular to the fundamental importance of openness and democratization for these processes. The guest also explained that in the USSR considerable efforts are being made to fulfill on schedule all commitments to the GDR in the economy, science, and technology. Dr Gysi expressed his gratitude for this explanation, since economic relations with the USSR are vital to the GDR national economy. Both partners expressed satisfaction that their parties and countries are now, together, treading the path to a democratic, socialist society. The CPSU Politburo member stressed the great interest of the USSR in GDR sovereignty. The sovereignty of the GDR is one of the prerequisites for stability and peace in Europe. At the same time, the guest welcomed the development of closer relations between the GDR and the FRG, including a treaty-based community in the interests of the people in both states. The development of these relations must, however, take place within the European framework.

SED's Gysi Opposed to Reunification

PM1512114189 Moscow TRUD in Russian 15 Dec 89 p 3

[Interview with SED Chairman G. Gysi by special correspondents Yu. Vasilkov and V. Nikitin: "Major Turning Point. SED Chairman G. Gysi on Renewal Processes in GDR"; date, place of interview not given; first two paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] Berlin, 14 Dec—As has already been reported, Gregor Gysi was elected chairman of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] at an extraordinary congress of the party 9 December.

Despite the immense concern associated with the current dramatic situation in the country and the preparations for the second phase of the SED Congress, G. Gysi received your TRUD correspondents. We note that on this day his secretariat received 66 requests for interviews from foreign correspondents.

[Question] Comrade Gysi, you are 41. Until recently you were mainly known only among lawyers. How and when did you sense that you might have to play the part of leader at a major turning point in the history of the party and the state?

[Gysi] A short time after E. Honecker was released from his position as general secretary of the SED Central Committee and the Politburo was renewed, it became obvious that radical changes awaited the party and that the former Central Committee and the new Politburo leadership would be unable to bring them about. It was then that I started to actively advocate fundamental change, even though I never thought that I would have to lead the party. On 3 December, when the Central Committee and Politburo members resigned, I and others were asked at a conference of party bezirk committee first secretaries to form a working committee to prepare for the extraordinary congress and to head the commission investigating breaches of party statutes and other abuses committed by former and current SED functionaries. We started working intensively, but 2 or 3 days later it became clear that the congress needed to be brought forward. As a result, it was scheduled for 8 December and was to resolve the questions of personnel appointments. It was then that I felt that at such a time it was impossible to avoid personal responsibility for the fate of renewal...

[Question] As is well known, more than 95 percent of delegates voted for you. The time has now come for crucial decisions. The theses of the party's draft program were published today. They stated that "further progress is bound up with democratic socialism." How do you view this?

[Gysi] By this we were primarily referring to new forms of political activity. These democratic forms will lead us to a new content in our work. This means that we will be able to make fuller use of the people's creative potential rather than stifling it, as was the case in the past. The concept of "socialism" is bound up both with questions of ownership and with the problems of social protection, which we do not want to sacrifice under any circumstances.

[Question] The German workers movement has rich socialist, communist, and antifascist traditions. Is the present crisis connected with a departure from these positions?

[Gysi] I think that since the formation of the GDR these traditions have been largely forgotten. We very quickly understood the Stalinist distortions and started building an administrative-edict system. This path led us into a dead end, although after April 1985 there was a chance to abandon this dead-end course.

[Question] The administrative-edict system produced a powerful and all-embracing apparatus which crushed

and restrained the masses' initiative. How do you see the apparatus' role under the conditions of democratic socialism?

[Gysi] I believe that we must fundamentally reduce the apparatus and change its structure, orienting it above all toward organizational work to achieve the party's political goals. It should become a link between the party's elective organs, party members, and all of society. It is easy to raise this task but hard to carry it out. We will see how much time it takes to solve it.

[Question] You headed the commission to investigate breaches of the party statutes. Many abuses were revealed. A large group of former Politburo members have been expelled from the party and are under arrest. The Prosecutor's Office is conducting its investigation. How, in your view, could such grotesque phenomena become embedded in the consciousness of people who were proclaiming bright revolutionary ideals?

[Gysi] Insofar as I am familiar with your country's history, I could ask you that question, too. It seems to me that undivided rule by a narrow group of people promotes the formation of a system of special privilege around that group. This system expands ad infinitum, and the high-ranking officials simply do not realize that they are promoting absolutist distortions. The absolute authority of the party leads to the absolute authority of the leadership, and this in turn leads to the absolute authority of the number one man in the leadership and his entourage. That is why we must resolutely change existing structures.

[Question] Incidentally, having become the number one figure in the party, what privileges do you have and enjoy?

[Gysi] I have a working office and a secretariat. I have an official car. It's a Zhiguli. For some reason the drivers, quite honestly, aren't crazy about it—they used to drive prestigious Western models. That's probably it.

[Question] As far as we can judge, the cases of corruption and other abuses that have come to light have severely affected the party's prestige. Is that so?

[Gysi] Yes it is, although the consequences of the party leadership's profound detachment from the people have been even more dramatic. The leaders simply didn't know how the people lived. That was a real political disaster.

[Question] A crisis is gripping not only the party but also many social organizations—the trade unions, for instance—which even until very recently accepted party directives without demur. What form should the party's relations with these organizations take in the future?

[Gysi] These relations must be completely restructured on the basis of the principle of the complete independence of both the party and the social organizations. We can talk only about cooperation, not administration. Of course, party members will actively participate in social organizations. As for the trade unions, I very much hope that they will maintain their unity. And reason should prevail: People should not demand the unrealistic. Trade unions should be responsible; they should not foster illusions among working people.

[Question] What already differentiates and should differentiate the present-day GDR socialist party, as you stated at the congress, from the former SED?

[Gysi] Anyone who followed the start of the extraordinary congress could see that the style was fundamentally changing. There wasn't a single report prepared beforehand by the apparatus. That included my report; I wrote the theses myself. We are striving to make the basis of the party democratic in order to ensure that grassroots party organizations are the main players. The principles of intraparty mutual relations should be reviewed, bearing in mind, above all, the elimination of the leadership's detachment from rank-and-file members. In this sense we are counting on a new form of contact—the party board's consultation and information center, which was opened the other day and is accessible to all.

[Question] Recent events have exacerbated the discussion about the possible unification of the two German states. What is the feeling among the GDR population on this question, and what is your party's position?

[Gysi] I proceed on the basis that most of the GDR's population advocates independence and the retention of the German socialist state. As for my party, it unanimously advocates this. The discussion about reunification of the two German states is acting as a brake on the real prospects for cooperation between them. This question is closely bound up not only with the fate of socialism in the GDR, but also with stability in the European home.

[Question] The press has reported your telephone conversation with M.S. Gorbachev and your forthcoming meeting with him. Does the new party leader have a view of the future relationship between our parties and countries?

[Gysi] We proceed on the basis that we will be bound by close ties to the CPSU. The CPSU is our great partner in the democratic transformation of socialist society. Our party will do everything to further strengthen friendship with the Soviet people. That is already stated in the congress platform.

[Question] And, finally, our last question: The second phase of the extraordinary congress starts Saturday. What feelings will its chairman have in opening it? Can it be called a congress of the consolidation of healthy forces? Does the board have any proposals on the party's new name?

[Gysi] It's hard to put my feelings into words. I'll be nervous, of course. The agenda for the second phase is very full. There will be a report from the former Central Committee and the Auditing and Control Commissions.

Moreover, we will have to analyze the causes of the crisis in the country and map out ways to make further progress. I will be speaking on this question. Thus, the congress will sign off on the past and outline a strategy for the future. This will be a program for the consolidation of healthy forces. As for the party's name, it will be determined democratically.

Baker, Modrow Advocate Stability, View Ties

PM1412105989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Dec 89 First Edition p 4

[TASS report under general rubric "In Socialist Countries": "Support for Reforms in the GDR"]

[Text] Berlin, 13 Dec—H. Modrow, chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers, has met with U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker in Potsdam. In the course of their conversation, questions concerning the international situation and relations between the two states were discussed.

J. Baker stated U.S. interest in a peaceful and stable development of the process of social reforms in the GDR and noted that there is broad support for them in the United States.

H. Modrow described the conversation as an expression of the great attention with which the United States is following the developments in the GDR. He stressed that the two sides have initiated a dialogue which, it may be hoped, will develop into cooperation. To the journalists' question as to whether the problem of German unity was discussed at the meeting, H. Modrow replied: "It was not discussed."

Soviets May Have Prevented Leipzig 'Bloodbath'

AU1412130089 Cologne Deutschland Network in German 1200 GMT 14 Dec 89

[Text] The Moscow Foreign Ministry cannot confirm statements made by Social Democratic Party Honorary Chairman Willy Brandt on the role of Soviet troops during events in Leipzig on 9 October. Quoting a spokesman for the Foreign Ministry in Moscow, the GDR news agency ADN reported that the ministry has no information about the intervention of Soviet military officers.

Brandt had said in a SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG interview that top Soviet liaison officers of the National People's Army had prevented a bloodbath during the demonstration in Leipzig on that day by ordering the tanks to stay in the barracks.

Perfilyev on CPCZ's Mlynar, Dubcek Visits

LD1412131289 Prague CTK in English 1232 GMT 14 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow Dec 14 (CTK correspondent)—Former Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee Secretary Zdenek Mlynar has been visiting Moscow, where he arrived yesterday at the invitation of the Association of Political Sciences and Moscow State University, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vadim Perfilyev told CTK today over telephone.

During his visit to Moscow, whose length has not yet been known, Zdenek Mlynar will meet with representatives of the association and university from which he graduated. As regards Mlynar's meeting with Soviet official representatives, there is no information available, the spokesman said.

Speaking about a possible visit of former first secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party Alexander Dubcek to the Soviet Union, Vadim Perfilyev said that Alexander Dubcek was invited by the Union of Soviet Film Artists and that this invitation is connected with a planned performance of a new Soviet film which contains an interview with him. Alexander Dubcek has not yet reacted to the invitation.

CSSR Presidential Nominees, Developments Noted

PM1512101589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 12

[Own correspondent L. Kornilov dispatch under the rubric "Panorama of International Events": "CSSR: Big Politics and the 'Trivia' of Life"]

[Text] Prague—An express survey conducted by the Institute of Public Opinion has shown that 80 percent of people favor a direct, nationwide presidential election (the idea was put forward by Communist deputies in the Federal Assembly). Only 20 percent of the respondents favor the "conventional" election envisaged by the present Constitution (in other words, when the president is elected by the Federal Assembly).

However, the political discussion of this subject is still going on. I shall remind you that so far the following people have been nominated as presidential candidates: V. Havel, L. Adamec, A. Dubcek, and C. Cisar. It is these names that have come up most frequently—and, moreover, in precisely this order—during sociological surveys. In some cases, the following names have also been mentioned: M. Calfa, B. Kucera, F. Cuba, V. Komarek, K. Urbanek, and Z. Mlynar.

The CSSR Federal Assembly session has come to an end. On the second day of its work it adopted four economic laws necessary for the functioning of a new economic mechanism from 1 January, namely: on currency, on budgetary payments, on banks, and on taxation. A new draft law on the state budget for 1990 will be submitted to parliament in March. A provisional budget has been approved for the first quarter of next year.

The front page of the 14 December issue of RUDE PRAVO carried an open letter from Communists on the editorial board to delegates to the Extraordinary Communist Party of Czechoslovakia [CPCZ] Congress. In it

they said, in particular: "RUDE PRAVO is currently the organ of the CPCZ Central Committee... Bitter experience has shown that, in pratice, this has resulted in its being subordinate to several persons in the party leadership and apparatus, who have decided what may and what may not be written. This has led to the alienation of the party newspaper from its readers and has contributed to the party's isolation from the people. The time has come to change this situation and make RUDE PRAVO the organ of the entire party, as it was when first founded. Only in this way, by answering to the whole party, will our newspaper's journalists be really able to become its front-rank political aktiv."

Every day in the CSSR brings many new things. Not all of them can be ranked alongside the main events, but it is often the case that "life's trivia" clearly reflect the processes of big politics. V. Dlougy [name as published], deputy chairman of the CSSR Government and chairman of the State Planning Commission, has begun talks with the owner and manager of the well-known Czechoslovak footwear firm, T. Bata, who arrived in the CSSR Thursday. G. Husak has asked K. Urbanek, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee, to be released from Central Committee membership. The printing of a new, 100-koruna banknote has been halted: The note bears the portrait of K. Gottwald. For the first time the CSSR has issued a postage stamp depicting the first president of the republic, T. Masaryk. Church figures are still demanding the separation of church and state. In Wenceslas Square, people volunteered to scale the walls of a building to bring down the slogan saying "With the Soviet Union for All Time," which hung opposite the footwear center (also built by Bata, incidentally). Increasingly broad demands are being made to remove the five-pointed star from the CSSR standard and restore the crown in its place. Information has been published on a gold "hoard"—donations collected by Czechs and Slovaks in support of the 1968 "Prague spring." They are still being held in special accounts in the State Bank and Finance Ministry. A spokesman for the Slovak "Public Against Violence" has categorically rejected all rumors of Slovakia seceding from the CSSR that are being circulated abroad.

Democratic Forum Member Views CPCZ Situation

PM1412151189 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 14 Dec 89 First Edition p 5

[Special correspondent I. Nekrasov dispatch: "CSSR: Who Will Be President?"]

[Text] Prague—Every journalist working in Prague knows this building just a couple of steps from Wenceslas Square. It houses the country's telegraph agency. The just-published newspapers are brought here, to the CTK forwarding department, from the various editorial offices shortly before midnight. The newspapers are different, as different as the opinions on what is happening in Czechoslovakia now.

It is obvious to everyone that a kind of line has been crossed with the formation of Czechoslovakia's new coalition government. It has been proven that the most acute problems can be successfully resolved around the negotiating table. The events of last Tuesday are graphic confirmation of this. The CSSR Federal Assembly acquired a new leader. He is Stanislav Kukral, a non-party person. He is 54 years old. A coalition government of Slovakia has been formed in Bratislava.

However, a number of questions still remain open. Students dissatisfied with the special parliamentary commission's progress in ascertaining the circumstances of the breaking up of the 17 November demonstration are continuing their strike. Federal Assembly deputies also held different opinions on one of the most complex and urgent problems: How must the presidential election take place? Will the president be named as the result of a referendum, or will this be done by deputies of the country's supreme legislative organ, in accordance with its Constitution? Different viewpoints were also expressed on the timing of the presidential election during the debate in the Federal Assembly.

In the present situation all political parties and public organizations are seeking to exert the greatest possible influence over the processes taking place in Czechoslovakia. Naturally, the Communists are not standing on the sidelines, for the Czechoslovak Communist Party [CPCZ] remains an influential political force.

The extraordinary CPCZ district conferences held the previous day showed that it is not enough just to acknowledge the mistakes of past years. It is necessary to seek a place on the political map of Czechoslovakia or, as is said here, seek a model of the left-wing forces' modern party.

The Democratic Forum of Communists, which functions independently within the existing party structures, is putting forward its own program, called a pre-congress platform. The forum, which came into existence 27 November, now unites approximately 60,000 members and is quite rapidly acquiring new supporters. Meeting with its representatives, I naturally endeavored to determine the nature of the new movement's activity. Is it a faction or a prototype of a radically renewed party?

"Above all," 41-year-old Miroslav Grossman, member of the CPCZ since May 1968, said, "we are in no way seeking to split the party. But if we are to speak of factionalism, it really has existed for many years. It is a question of people who have compromised the CPCZ, who have essentially forgotten the reason why they are in its ranks, and who have pursued only their own narrow, mercenary interests.

"The Democratic Forum of Communists emerged out of the wish of many Communists to find ways out of the very grave crisis in the party, the apogee of which was 17 November, to conduct an active dialogue on all 'painful points,' and to propose and discuss alternative solutions. Can this really be called factionalism? To have the right

to champion one's own viewpoint—is this not a return to Leninist principles of internal party life?" the representative of the Democratic Forum of Communists asked me.

"What way out of the situation that has taken shape in the party can there be?"

"There are two ways out," my interlocutor replied. "The first is de-Stalinization of the CPCZ, an essential condition of which is the departure from the leadership of those cadres whose activity is linked with the neo-Stalinist period. The second is the creation of a new party. In this case the CPCZ could lose what is almost the chief thing now—time. The processes now occurring both in the CPCZ and in Czechoslovakia must not be compared mechanically with the changes in other East European countries, above all because we have strong democratic traditions and the people's political culture is high. Precisely this enables us to resolve disputed questions at a 'roundtable.' And I will also remind you that the Communist Party in our country did not emerge as some sectarian group but as a truly popular, mass movement. Socialism in our country must be built with people and for people, proceed from their interests, and be aimed at meeting their interests. And in this we voice solidarity with the direction of the perestroyka processes in the Soviet Union, for the changes in Czechoslovakia would be inconceivable without the changes in the USSR."

100,000 at Sofia Rally Support BCP Reforms

PM1512095589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 12

[Own correspondent A. Kapralov dispatch under the rubric "Panorama of International Events": "Bulgaria: Rally of 100,000 in Support of Plenum"]

[Text] Sofia—The resolution adopted by the Bulgarian Communist Party (BCP) Central Committee plenum is concerned with the beginning of a radical turn in the development of the party and the country. The new policy aims to lead Bulgaria out of its economic and social crisis, create a democratic, rule-of-law state, and radically restructure the party; it will also lead to the building of truly democratic socialism.

The plenum expelled Todor Zhivkov and his son Vladimir from the party, as well as T. Zhivkov's closest associate, Milko Balev. An extraordinary BCP congress is to be convened on 19 March 1990.

The plenum expressed the belief that radical reforms must be carried out in order to overcome crisis phenomena in the economy. These reforms will aim to create a socialist market economy, in which equality of all forms of ownership will be guaranteed. At the same time, the resolution points out, beginning in 1990 it will be necessary to take decisive measures to stabilize the domestic market and provide the population with foodstuffs and other essential goods.

The plenum supported numerous proposals from communists and non-party people on radically restructuring economic relations in agriculture. Land must be made available to those who work it, without any restrictions on the choice of the form of ownership.

The domination of the authoritarian administrative system, the resolution says, has led to profound deformations in the country's state and social structure. Consequently, restructuring's main task is to eliminate this system, create a socialist civil society on a democratic basis, develop citizens' rights and freedoms, demarcate powers, and confirm the role of the National Assembly as the supreme permanent body.

The plenum recommended that the National Assembly pass a new law on elections, on the basis of which free, democratic elections can be held at the end of the first half of 1990. The proposal was submitted to the parliamentary session that opened on 14 December to remove the clause from the Constitution which says the BCP is the leading force in society and the state.

The Central Committee believes the party must have a fundamentally new relationship with other political and social organizations, movements, and initiatives. This relationship must be built on the basis of equality and partnership.

The plenum's decisions have met with deep approval in the country. A mass rally staged immediately after the plenum in 9 September Square was an expression of solidarity with the BCP. More than 100,000 people gathered in the square chanted: "The BCP! Unity!"

In an interview given after the rally to the newspaper RABOTNICHESKO DELO, party leader P. Mladenov said "it was an amazing expression of support for the party line and support for its new course.... I think the rally was the first test of readiness to follow the BCP line."

Bulgarian Economic, Political Changes Viewed

LD1412140989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0630 GMT 13 Dec 89

[Text] Last night our Sofia correspondent Viktor Samarin reported details of the work at the Bulgarian Communist Party plenum, which was devoted to the problem of determining priorities in improving the country's economy and reviving the political and spiritual life of Bulgarian society. Our talk with the correspondent began with the question about which changes can be expected in Bulgaria. This is what Viktor Samarin replied:

[Begin recording] [Samarin] The plenum unanimously rejected the command-administrative system, which has deformed socialism and blocked the creative potential of the people. Among the specific proposals and recommendations to the People's Assembly and the government is the so-called program of stabilization envisaging

immediate improvement of the situation in the consumer market. On the strategic level the plenum posed the question of the creation of a market economy in the country, in combination with state planning of the basic sectors of the national economy. It was also decided, by the end of the year, to draft a new bill on property and submit it, via the Communist Party's parliamentary faction, for examination by the People's Assembly.

[Announcer] All that has to do with the economy, but it is known—and we, too, are able to see this for ourselves daily—that deep economic perestroyka is impossible without equally deep political changes. How was this interrelationship examined at the plenum?

[Samarin] In my view, in the most radical way. It has been decided to convene already in March of next year an out-of-turn Bulgarian Communist Party Congress to work out a comprehensive program of perestroyka in the party itself. The People's Assembly has been recommended to draft and adopt a law on elections and to name a date for free democratic elections not later than May of next year to truly ensure the people's representation at them. Incidentally, at the plenum the practice of symbiosis of party and state, which has taken shape, was resolutely rejected as contradictory to the logic of civilized and democratic development. The line of division of the status and function of the legislative, executive, and law enforcement bodies of power was proclaimed. In this connection, or rather also in this connection, the question of revising the Constitution and possibly—this is to be decided by the People's Assembly—that of the adoption of a new basic law of the country was posed.

[Announcer] As we have touched on the Constitution, the following question arises: In the basic law of Bulgaria, just as in ours, there is a point on the leading role of the Communist Party. It is also known that many people in Bulgaria now are insisting on its abolition. Was this mentioned at the Bulgarian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum?

[Samarin] Yes, there is such a point in the Bulgarian Constitution, too. And it is No. 1; not No. 6 as in ours. And on this subject, the plenum expressed itself absolutely and definitely, too. Petur Mladenov and other speakers stressed that the constitutional declaration of the leading role of the party was radically incorrect, that Communists should ensure their vanguard mission in society and their national authority by their very activity in the interest of the people, but such realities were not affirmed by decrees and ukases and legislative acts. And in the revision of the Constitution, this point, in the plenum's opinion, should be rejected along with some other meaningless anachronisms of the command-administrative system. It is for parliament to decide. At the same time, they are also right in considering that hastily tearing only this single point from the Constitution will obliquely signify a kind of punitive sanction against the whole party, with which those who are specifically to blame for many of the country's present troubles are just now trying to associate themselves, the opponents of the changes started by the party's healthy forces. [end recording]

Romania Seen Tightening Border Controls

PM1412147789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 8

[News agency roundup: "Border Defenses Stepped Up"]

[Text] The Romanian Communist Party Political Executive Committee has decided to transfer protection of the country's border from the Ministry of National Defense to the Ministry of Internal Affairs.

Although officially the reason for this step is not being explained, observers believe that it was prompted by a desire to make illegal border crossings more difficult. In the past 2 years alone tens of thousands of Romanian citizens, mainly of Hungarian extraction, have made such crossings. The last one was the escape across Hungarian territory to the United States by the well-known gymnast Nadia Comaneci.

The Romanian authorities had already implemented measures to step up controls in July this year, expanding to 1 kilometer the special zone running along the border. Within this zone there are strict limitations on the height of trees and bushes in order to facilitate the border guards' work.

Moscow Soiree Marks Albanian Anniversary

PM1412124389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Dec 89 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] A soiree was held at Moscow's House of Friendship 13 December to mark the 45th anniversary of Albania's liberation from the fascist aggressors and the victory of the people's revolution. Those present talked about the Soviet public's activity aimed at giving Soviet people extensive familiarization with the Albanian people's life and work and the transformations taking place in Albania.

West Europe

Problems Facing Germanys, Reunification Viewed

PM1512104789 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 15 Dec 89 First Edition p 5

[V. Agayev dispatch: "The Wall Is Down, the Problems Remain. What People in the FRG and GDR Think About the Present and Future of the Two Countries"]

[Text] Bonn—**"Kohl Plan" Doubtful**

A peaceful, bloodless, civilized revolution. These are the definitions most often used today in the West when speaking of the events in the GDR. Heated passions

always excite the imagination, and there is no shortage of plans and predictions in West Germany. The journal STERN, for example, even offers a "report from the future," entitled "Journey to Unity." It describes "practical" steps taken toward the reunification of Germany in the first years of the next millennium.

But let us put aside this fantastic issue of STERN, dated 6 January 2000, and take a look at the December television screen of this year. The tornado of information is sweeping through all channels at once. News, rallies, discussions, interviews. The Bundestag debates are currently being broadcast and the chancellor's plan for overcoming the division of Germany and Europe discussed. The 10-point program envisages a whole catalog of measures, steps, demands, and decisions leading through "confederative structures" to a federation.

In this respect, Kohl emphasizes: "At present no one knows how a reunified Germany will look, but this unity will come if the Germans desire it." The course of the debates is very typical of the present situation in the FRG. At first, everyone, with the exception of the "Greens," appeared to support the chancellor; observers even spoke of euphoria in the Bundestag, but in the course of the 4-day discussion this unanimity has collapsed.

Vogel, the leader of the FRG Social Democrats, has talked about the reasons why this has happened: "At first we welcomed the proposal from Kohl, who had simply taken up our stand on many important points. Then we added another three points: the inviolability of the western Polish border, self-determination for the GDR people at every stage of the 10-point plan, and the question of short-range missiles. You must agree that these missiles marry ill with the chancellor's proposals. How can we continue to insist on retaining missiles directed at Leipzig, Rostock, and other cities in the GDR and East Europe? The chancellor has described the Helsinki process as the basis of present-day development in Europe and the German state. We were also overjoyed to hear that he has abandoned the idea of an anschluss of the GDR and the idea that it is necessary to start with the unification of the two Germanys."

However, outside the FRG, Kohl's plan has been received fairly cautiously. Polish Foreign Minister K. Skubiszewski believes that its failure to mention the question of the two German states' borders with neighboring countries, primarily the border along the Oder-Neisse, is a fundamental shortcoming. Any program for achieving the unity of the German people becomes unrealistic when abstracted from the territorial situation, he said.

Another important point is that Kohl's plan fails to mention the need to preserve the present status quo in Europe, which is currently based on the principle of inviolability of borders, as enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act. How is one to match up the unification of the two German states into one international legal organism with the mutual strategic security of the Soviet Union and the United States? The chancellor does not answer this question, although he proceeds from the need for considerable changes in the existing political, military, and territorial system in the heart of Europe.

U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker recently spoke about precisely this, when he noted that the process of reunification must be "peaceful and must consider the legitimate fears of everyone involved in the process of creating a new Europe." He also stressed that the U.S. allies in World War II, including the Soviet Union, have rights and responsibilities which should be taken into account in the solution of this problem.

Why Are the "Greens" Against?

The "Greens" are categorically opposed to any unification whatsoever: Their party believes that only by recognizing the GDR's full sovereignty will it be possible to erect a political barrier to its being put up for grabs. What does it mean? In opening its border on 9 November the GDR seemed to return to the situation of 1961, when the wall had not yet been built. The "black market" in goods and services has revived. But it is not the open border that is to blame for this: The border between the FRG and Belgium is also open and there is no "black market." An idea considered seditious until recently has now been confirmed: Instead of building a wall that has proved expensive in every sense of the word, a reasonable solution to the problem should have been sought at the time.

But we will not now talk about the lost opportunities and mistakes made on both sides of the Berlin Wall and the "Iron Curtain." We will take a look at what is happening now. Having been given the right to freely cross the border, GDR citizens have not fled the country, as many had feared they might, but have begun to visit the FRG on their free days. Many have friends and relatives there, but the majority go simply to walk around and look at everything—and everyone, of course, wants to buy something.

But where are they to get the money from? The FRG Government, which sees GDR citizens as its poor relatives, makes them a present of DM100 each every year. FRG banks are buying "Eastern marks" at market prices—in other words, depending on supply and demand. The banks are currently giving only 10 Western marks for 100 GDR marks, and 800 Eastern marks for 100 Western marks. Everything is in circulation: hard-earned savings and dishonestly accumulated capital. One newspaper carried a brief report on an otherwise unremarkable person who brought 3 million Eastern marks to the currency exchange point.

Others are bringing smaller sums, but both here and in the GDR there is a problem of "hot money." There are no goods to soak up 152 billion Eastern marks in the GDR. That is why many, heaving a sigh and fearful of customs control, are taking this money to the West. If

this were purely one-way traffic, the Eastern mark would have been completely depreciated on the very first day. However, it seems that there are a considerable number of people who are seizing the moment and buying up Eastern marks for a song so as to subsequently buy dachas and other real estate in the GDR through straw men. "At times, we find we are short of Eastern money," the heads of many bank departments complain. "We have to turn to dealers in Zurich."

As before, these problems are most keenly felt in West Berlin. The newspaper DIE ZEIT has written in this connection: "Hardly had the anarchic rejoicing of the first night died down before the 'black economy,' by no means slumbering, was alive and kicking again. West Berlin has been turned into one gigantic bazaar. Speculation, theft, fraud—everyone after his own fashion. Citizens of the GDR, West Berliners, Poles, West Germans, Americans, Frenchmen, Algerians, Vietnamese—money and goods are moving in all directions. Lines, long forgotten in the West, are forming outside inexpensive stores. The local inhabitants are already secretly yearning for those recent times when they could go shopping in peace."

Four times as many cases of pickpocketing have been registered in West Berlin. The victims are mainly guests from the East. The number of cases of shoplifting has also increased. But the turnover of the cheaper department stores has leaped by 40 percent.

DIE ZEIT tells how a family of five can obtain 800 Western marks: First the mother goes with the three children and then the father—also with the children. It is simply impossible to introduce any kind of computer control in such a short time. Many are taking antiques, the family silver, and stamp and coin collections with them to the West.

Life has shown that the wall erected 28 years ago only deterred small-time speculators. It was terrible to read in a recent issue of Hamburg's DER SPIEGEL about the mafia-like nature of the currency operations conducted until recently under the leadership of GDR State Secretary Schalck-Golodkowski...

End to the "Cold War"?

The already-tense situation in the FRG labor market has become more complicated. Where is work to be found for 250,000 immigrants when your country already has more than 2 million unemployed? True, there are 180,000 jobs in the country waiting to be filled, but it is not always possible to find an apartment where there is work, and vice versa. Doctors are in an extremely difficult situation. The medical profession is one of the most lucrative in the FRG, and there is currently a surplus of 10,000 doctors. One can only hazard a guess at what they think when they hear that another 4,000 medics have come from the GDR. True, it is hard to say what they are hoping to find here. It is still possible to secure a practice—in other words, buy equipment and premises or obtain them on credit—but it is not possible to get a sufficient number of patients, and, after all, a doctor's living here comes solely from his patients' fees.

What is more, the emigre doctors have found themselves in a morally vulnerable position as well. The press is constantly berating them for the fact that they have broken the Hippocratic oath and abandoned their patients in the GDR. (That country is now short of 10 percent of its personnel; soldiers and members of the police often have to stand in for sisters and nurses, but no one can stand in for the doctors). But it is precisely in this complex sphere that a way to resolve the problem is becoming clear: The FRG Health Ministry is drawing up a program whereby West German doctors will work in medical institutions in the GDR.

Many FRG firms are now looking for constructive solutions. Volkswagen, for example, is proposing to transfer motor assembly operations from Southeast Asia to a plant in the GDR. Minister of Economics Haussmann is drawing up his own aid and cooperation plan. Chancellor Kohl is talking of the need for cooperation in developing the GDR telephone network. The number of such proposals is growing, but fears are growing too—primarily GDR fears that the powerful FRG will swallow up the tiny GDR and that Western concerns, international banks, and speculators will spread throughout the country before it has determined its path in the world.

However, it is no accident that there is so much talk here of an end to the "cold war." It is not speculation and theft that determine the nature of Germans today and it is not only money that interests them. Every day you see a multitude of events that vary in significance but are oriented in the same direction.

Bavarian Premier Interviewed on East-West Ties

PM1412162389 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 13 Dec 89 p 3

[Interview with Max Streibl, prime minister of Bavaria, by our special correspondent Yu. Popov in Munich: "Bavaria Has Everything. Why?"; date of interview not given]

[Excerpt] Munich—[Passage omitted] [Popov] At the moment there are many visitors from the GDR in Munich and other FRG cities. At the recent Christian Social Union [CSU] Congress, too, there was not a speaker, including Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl, who did not devote a substantial part of his address to the prospects for inter-German relations. How do you, Mr Prime Minister, assess the situation that has taken shape and the prospects for its development?

[Streibl] The impetus for the development of the present situation was, unquestionably, provided by the perestroyka and glasnost that have arrived in the GDR from the Soviet Union. People have acquired great freedom. It is not just a question of freedom of movement, but also of freedom in the sphere of the economy, politics, and culture.

As for the unification of the two German states, this is a long-term question which affects the interests of more than the GDR and the FRG alone. We are building the "common European" home, which comprises a multitude of aspects of relations between states both in the West and East of Europe. This process will take place gradually, spanning many years. We support it, and we are prepared to develop relations with all the countries of Eastern Europe. It seems to us that the political structure of the European Continent should be built on the federal principle, taking account of the special characteristics of the economic development, culture, language, and customs of the people which will inhabit the respective "apartments" of the common European home. The federal principle has acquitted itself well in the conditions of the FRG and, coupled with M.S. Gorbachev's idea of the common European home, it could provide a solid basis for the future of our continent.

As for the immediate relations between the two German states, there can, of course, be no mention of automatic unification or the "absorption" of the GDR by its more powerful Western neighbor, as some people are saying. No one is interested in such a development.

[Popov] How, in light of the changes taking place, do you assess the prospects for the development of relations between the FRG and the USSR, between Bavaria and the Soviet Union?

[Streibl] Naturally, I am more competent to answer the question about the development of relations between Bavaria and your country. I would like to mention just a few concrete examples of our readiness to assist the Soviet reforms. A school for managers functions in Bavaria where seminars and symposiums for leaders of Soviet enterprises are held regularly with the participation of our leading specialists. Bavaria's geographical location forces us to think more than others about the future fate of Europe. For one thing, we are located on the fringe of the "Common Market," and for another, we share a border with countries in Eastern Europe. Therefore I, just like my predecessor Franz Josef Strauss, want to maintain friendly relations with all our neighbors in both East and West. We are convinced that this is also what people in the Soviet Union want.

As for the prospects for the development of our relations, they concern, above all, the development of economic relations. Tremendous reserves for cooperation exist here. In the sphere of politics, as I have said earlier, we are united by the idea of building the common European home. Apart from that, there is the sphere of cultural exchanges, tourism, especially young people's tourism, and many other aspects of collaboration that we are only just focusing on.

With the improvement of living standards in the USSR and other countries of Eastern Europe, many contradictions and problems that are currently dividing our peoples will disappear.

Belousov, Italian Envoy View Defense Conversion

LD1412120389 Moscow TASS in English 1043 GMT 13 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 13 TASS—Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Igor Belousov today received Ferdinando Salleo, Italian ambassador to the USSR, at his request.

In furtherance of understandings achieved during Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Italy, the sides exchanged opinions on economic, scientific and technical cooperation between the two countries in the conversion of the Soviet defence industry.

Proposed Soviet-Turkish Economic Projects Listed

NC1312205689 Istanbul HURRIYET in Turkish 7 Dec 89 p 11

[Text] Ankara, (HURRIYET)—The Turkish Foreign Ministry has disclosed that Turkey is satisfied with the contacts made by Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Lev Alekseyevich Voronin and with the talks that were held between the Soviet Union and Turkey during his visit. Voronin is expected to depart Turkey today. Speaking at a press conference yesterday, Foreign Ministry Spokesman Murat Sungar said that the economic talks between the two countries were held in a very positive atmosphere.

While explaining the course of the talks, Sungar listed the following projects the Soviets proposed to realize in Turkey:

1. Expansion of the Aliaga refinery.

2. Electrification of the Turkish railway tracks.

3. Construction of a subway in Ankara.

Sungar listed the following projects Turkey proposed to realize in the Soviet Union:

1. Construction of cement factories.

2. Production of RAKS videotapes.

3. Construction of leather processing installations.

4. Production of vehicle tires by the Sabanci group.

5. Cooperation in the electronics industry between the Netas Company and Soviet establishments.

6. Realization of projects related to the Soviet Union's wish to purchase $350 million worth of foodstuffs, light industry products, and health equipment.

GUARDIAN 'Fabrication' on Cyprus Base Decried

PM1412120189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Dec 89 First Edition p 4

[Major M. Pogorelyy commentary: "Disinformation Does Not Rest. The Latest Fabrication"]

[Text] A few days ago the British newspaper THE GUARDIAN tried to outdo its famous compatriot Sherlock Holmes. If the great sleuth managed to find a treasure in a goose's stomach, THE GUARDIAN managed to find something that does not exist at all—an alleged Soviet naval base on the north coast of Cyprus. For greater authenticity it even cites its name, "Cape Andreas."

In connection with this report, I would like to note the following. First, the Soviet Union has no military bases in the Mediterranean, as has been stated more than once at official level. The only installation used by the USSR Navy for its purposes is a material and technical service point in Syria, the port of Tartus. Second, it is Britain rather than the USSR which maintains its military bases in Cyprus—Akrotiri and Dhekelia. They occupy 99 square miles of the island's territory, no less. Two motorized infantry battalions and a ground forces support subunit (some 3,000 men) are deployed there. Akrotiri is a British Air Force strategic bomber air base. Apart from that it is being used by U.S. reconnaissance aircraft.

Third, THE GUARDIAN has specified a locality in the Turkish part of the island which since the proclamation of the "Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus" in 1983 has been controlled by units of the Turkish 11th Army Corps made up of two infantry divisions. So what kind of Soviet base can there be behind NATO forces' lines? How could they overlook it?

Those who might suspect the Turkish military of nurturing special sympathies for the USSR may rest assured: After all, for a quarter of century now the UN peacekeeping forces in Cyprus—an entirely objective observer—have been stationed here.

All this has made it possible for the USSR Foreign Ministry to assess THE GUARDIAN report as "absurd." For my part, I would like to add that the publication of this fabrication was no accident. It was timed to coincide with the Soviet-U.S. meeting off the shores of Malta.

Undoubtedly, the light of truth will disperse the gloom of lies, in the words of an Oriental maxim. Nonetheless, it remains to be desired that there is as little of this gloom as possible in relations between countries, thus giving rise to as few "Cape Andereases" and other fabrications as possible.

UK Moves Against Suspected War Criminals Noted

PM1512120789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 12

[Own correspondent A. Krivopalov dispatch: "Shadows of the Past and the Law"]

[Excerpts] London—By a majority (348 votes to 123), the British House of Commons has voted to recognize the need to amend legislation to enable the country's courts to examine criminal cases concerning people who are guilty of the murder of civilians on the territory of fascist Germany or the lands occupied by it from 1939 to 1945. [passage omitted]

In the United States the names of 1,200 former war criminals have been established, of whom 30 have been stripped of U.S. citizenship and deported. Canada is now investigating the cases of over 200 people suspected of committing similar crimes. Australia's legal authorities have now examined the cases of 628 former Hitlerites.

Britain, however, lags behind in this respect. The investigations begun here are making progress, of course, but without practical results as yet. Quite some time passed before it was established that around 300 fascist accomplices had found refuge in the United Kingdom after the war. Some of them subsequently fled to other countries, some have died. Now the British, who are trying to unravel this problem, have reached the conclusion that there are 177 suspected war criminals, and 3 should have been tried without delay. There is no shadow of doubt about their guilt.

The question of amending the law is to be discussed by the British Government, where, it is said, opinions are divided. Prime Minister Thatcher herself is thought to support the formation of a special parliamentary commission.

Latin America & Caribbean

Cuba Stresses Food Output, 'Impending Problems'

PM1412112389 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Dec 89 First Edition p 4

[TASS dispatch under general rubric "In the Socialist Countries": "Meeting in Havana"]

[Text] Havana, 13 Dec—A working meeting of leaders of the Cuban Communist Party [PCC] under the chairmanship of Fidel Castro has opened at the Havana Palace of the Revolution. Taking part are PCC party secretaries from the municipal-organization level upward. The purpose of this meeting, the newspaper GRANMA writes, is to examine the implementation of the key programs of the country's economic and social development, so as to "prepare for possible negative consequences that the current international situation may produce."

In his speech at the meeting F. Castro emphasized the priority importance of food production for Cuba "in connection with impending problems."

Congress of People's Deputies

Congress Marks Andrey Sakharov's Death

LD1512093689 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] Today before the start of a routine session of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, Vitaliy Ivanovich Vorotnikov, who is chairing it, said:

[Begin recording] [Vorotnikov] Respected comrade deputies, it is with deep regret that I inform you that yesterday Academician Andrey Dmitriyevich Sakharov, people's deputy of the USSR, passed away suddenly. Life suddenly came to an end for one of the country's great scientists, a major public figure. His contribution to our state's defense capability at the most difficult and dangerous time was enormous and unique. His indefatigable public activity evoked a response throughout the world. An objective analysis of its different aspects henceforth becomes the property of history. Everything that Andrey Dmitriyevich did was dictated by his vigilant conscience and his profound communist convictions. I request you to honor the memory of Academician Andrey Dmitriyevich Sakharov, people's deputy of the USSR, with 1 minute of silence.

The floor is given to Academician Likhachev.

[Likhachev] I would like to say very briefly that with the death of Andrey Dmitriyevich Sakharov, a part of our heart has left us. We might have been in agreement with some of his proposals, or have disagreed with them, but he was a person of absolute sincerity, of absolute purity. This led to his success both in science and to his position in public life. I propose that during the time of the funeral of Andrey Dmitriyevich the deputies should be given the opportunity to pay their last respects to him, that the session should be interrupted for half an hour, or an hour, as will be possible.

[Vorotnikov] I think that the proposal of Academician Likhachev is worthy of attention. Without doubt, all the deputies attending the congress will take part in this civil funeral of Andrey Dmitriyevich Sakharov. [end recording]

[Moscow TASS in English at 0736 GMT on 15 December carries a similar item which adds: "Likhachev proposed interrupting the session of the congress during the funeral to allow deputies to bid farewell to the deceased. The Congress supported this proposal."]

Biography of Andrey Sakharov

LD1512094389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0730 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, 15 Dec (TASS)—At the Congress of USSR People's Deputies which is taking place in the Kremlin, an announcement was made today about the death of Academician Andrey Sakharov, the major Soviet scientist, nuclear physicist, well-known public figure, an active champion of human rights, and a USSR People's Deputy. The deputies honored his memory with 1 minute's silence.

Andrey Sakharov was born in Moscow on 21 May 1921. He graduated from Moscow University's Faculty of Physics. Until 1945 he worked at a factory as an engineer and inventor, and then became a research student at the Lebedev Physics Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, where his supervisor was one of the greatest Soviet theoretical physicists, Academician Igor Tamm, the Nobel prizewinner. In 1948 Andrey Sakharov was included in the scientific research group working on the development of thermonuclear weapons. The idea of a magnetic thermonuclear reactor, proposed by him and developed jointly with Tamm, formed the basis for works in the USSR on controlled thermonuclear synthesis.

For his works Andrey Sakharov was awarded three times the title of Hero of Socialist Labor and won a State and a Lenin Prize. From 1953 onward he was a full member of the USSR Academy of Sciences. He was also elected a member of a number of foreign academies and holds honorary doctorates from many universities.

In 1953-68, while already in the process of developing thermonuclear weapons, Andrey Sakharov became increasingly acutely aware of the moral problems generated by this. From the late fifties onward he started to campaign actively for the halting or limiting of nuclear weapons testing and was one of the initiators of the 1963 Moscow treaty banning tests in the three environments (atmosphere, water, and space). His first appeal in defense of human rights dates from the late Sixties, and his work "Progress, Peaceful Coexistance, and Intellectual Freedom" appeared, followed by "My Country and the World."

Andrey Sakharov represented the USSR Academy of Sciences in the USSR's highest legislative body.

Funeral Commission Formed

LD1512110189 Moscow TASS in English 1043 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 15 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The Presidium of the Second Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR today formed a commission to organise the funeral of People's Deputy Academician Andrey Sakharov who died yesterday at age 68.

The announcement was made by Vitaliy Vorotnikov, member of the Politburo of the Soviet Communist Party's Central Committee and president of the Presidium of the Russian Federation's Supreme Soviet, who opened the congressional sitting after the first break today.

The commission, approved by the congress, is headed by Academician Yevgeniy Primakov, alternate member of

the Politburo and chairman of the Council of the Union (one of the two chambers of Soviet Parliament).

The commission also comprises:
—Academician Guriy Marchuk, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences
—Academician Vitaliy Ginzburg,
—Academician Dmitriy Likhachev,
—Academician Roald Sagdeyev,
—Lev Ryabev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers,
—Valeriy Saikin, mayor of Moscow.

The commission was assigned to consider all questions connected with the organisation of the funeral.

Congress Debate on Article 6 Viewed

LD1512040789 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 14 Dec 89

[Sergey Goryachev commentary]

[Excerpts] On Tuesday [12 December] the Congress of People's Deputies here in Moscow voted against debating Article 6 of the national Constitution which gives the Communist Party the leading role in society. Mikhail Gorbachev had to take considerable efforts to persuade the deputies to put off discussion of the issue til a later date. Sergey Goryachev of our staff has been studying the reasons that prompted the Soviet leader to press for excluding debates over the Constitution article from the congressional agenda. Here is what he writes:

Considering the drastic changes in Eastern Europe where some countries have already cancelled constitutional articles guaranteeing their communist parties the leader role in society, the decision taken by the Congress of People's Deputies may strike one as a relapse of old thinking and Mikhail Gorbachev's position steering away from the road of speedy reforms. On the other hand, the Soviet leader seems to have chosen the only possible way of avoiding a split in the country and ruling out likely social (?shocks).

Perestroyka is indeed going through a crucial period and many maintain its future is endangered. Price jumps and goods shortages have been causing dissatisfaction on the part of those who expected the restructuring to improve their living standards. Meanwhile there have been increasingly vocal allegations that perestroyka signals a departure from socialist ideals. A participant in the recent Central Committee full scale meeting, the writer Daniel Granin, has described to the weekly MOSCOW NEWS the accusations brought against Mikhail Gorbachev. The writer said he repeatedly heard that Gorbachev had to cope with strong resistance from the party and bureaucratic elite, but now he could see for himself that a vigorous struggle was underway in the top echelons.

In that context, Gorbachev's decision not to aggravate the conflict or, as he put it in his address to the Congress, not to provoke a clash within society, does seem to be wise. A closer look at the situation will show that the removal of the controversial constitutional article cannot as such bring about any major changes in the distribution (?of) forces. This can however be achieved by elections of local governments that have begun in various Soviet republics. When the election campaign is through next spring the nation will see the degree of public support which the Communist Party enjoys in real terms. If that degree is sufficiently high the question of amending Article Six of the Constitution will in no way undermine the party's virtual prestige [as heard]. If the Communist candidates suffer a defeat, they will accept the abolition of the constitutionally guaranteed leading role as a natural and logical move. The fact that Mikhail Gorbachev has found himself under criticism from the radically minded citizens shows that not all of them by far can understand that tactical concessions may help bring closer the attainment of the ultimate strategic goal, the success of perestroyka.

Maslyukov Argues Need for Central Planning

PM1512105589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Dec 89 Second Edition pp 1, 5

["Lightning Interview" in Moscow 14 December with Yu. D. Maslyukov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee, by parliamentary correspondent Yu. Ursov: "Yu.D. Maslyukov: 'Emotions and Arguments'"]

[Text] Yesterday the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies continued in sections the discussion of the USSR Council of Ministers report "On Measures to Improve the Economy, the Stages of the Economic Reform, and Fundamental Approaches to Drawing Up the 13th 5-Year Plan." In a break between sittings Yu. D. Maslyukov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee, answered questions from PRAVDA parliamentary correspondent Yu. Ursov.

[Ursov] Yuriy Dmitriyevich, it could have been expected that the government program would be criticized, but in my view the criticism in some speeches was very harsh, to put it mildly. Some government proposals are even described as "antiperestroyka...."

[Maslyukov] The government set forth its program with well-reasoned new approaches to the development of the national economy and the economic reform. I will specially single out from among the many "firsts" in N.I. Ryzhkov's report the fact that three strategic options for the country's economic and social development in the next 5-year period have been brought to the Congress' attention. This is an unusual approach, but I am sure that it will become the rule. The government proposes

adopting the third option. It ensures the economy's social orientation without sharply upsetting its proportions.

However, it must be seen that each of the options contains measures to democratize the economic mechanism. To fail to notice this would mean taking the path of attaching labels and substituting emotions for specific arguments. It was a complex matter shaping the program. A large, qualified collective of scientists and specialists worked on it. It analyzes and generalizes numerous indicators of the objective state of the economy.

Their conclusions were the basis for the government proposals, which, of course, it is not forbidden to criticize. The debate is getting under way precisely in order to verify as accurately as possible the way to develop the economy in a new capacity. The only difference is that the government works with figures, while many of our opponents work with speculative ideas, albeit outwardly striking ones. But let us argue on equal terms: Whoever doubts the authenticity and reality of our calculations—set out your figures and forecasts. Otherwise the boldest criticism, forgive me, is not worth a plug nickel.

Here I draw your attention to the fact that centralized planning must not be identified with the administrative-edict system. Many of our critics combine these concepts. However, they are far from being the same thing.

[Ursov] Many PRAVDA articles have been devoted to the negative influence of gross indicators. Can it be considered that the subject will be exhausted?

[Maslyukov] Generalizing cost indicators are retained at the national economic level. Enterprises have been freed from indicators approved in a directive manner. At the same time they will, as a rule, use the net output indicator for their calculations in the 13th 5-Year Plan. This scheme fully accords with our policy of drawing up the plan "from below," from the level of enterprises.

Another important innovation: Turnover tax will gradually be replaced by a value-added tax on every sale. This will create a basis for a cardinal reform of price formation and also for shaping finances with due regard for the actual contribution of each enterprise and region. It is also proposed to introduce a very severe tax on superprofits and antimonopoly measures. All this is to erect a barrier to the pursuit of unearned income.

[Ursov] Certain speakers today speak of the market as a panacea for all ills. But what about centralized planning?

[Maslyukov] Obviously, the market has a mass of advantages. But no one can eliminate its major shortcomings too. Therefore, in demanding the immediate introduction of the market—and this option was also examined by the government—the specific realities must not be forgotten: the unbalanced nature of monetary and material resources, the shortage of consumer goods and many types of output, the suffocating spirals of inflation, and other factors. Under these conditions there is more chance of getting quite the opposite consequences, which will primarily hit at tens of millions of our poorly-off fellow citizens.

In general, the state has a great role to play in all developed market economies. In Sweden, for example, there is 70-percent state regulation of the gross product. The role of centralized regulation of our economy is all the more important in its present unstable, intermediate state.

In this connection the government program proposes a package of measures. Both for the transitional period and for the more remote future, when, I hope, the situation will have stabilized. It is planned, in particular, to employ a unified system of taxes on profit or income, to regulate the consumption fund of enterprises and organizations by means of taxes, to introduce a new system of a progressive tax on the population's income, to regulate the prices of socially significant goods and services, and to use other levers by which society realizes social priorities in the economy through state planning.

[Ursov] Speeches at the Congress touch on the problem of the "shadow economy...."

[Maslyukov] It is possible to argue about the specific characteristics of the "shadow economy," but, when adopting very important laws, its existence must be taken into account. I will say briefly that the government has provided for a number of measures to squeeze underground magnates out of the economic space by neutralizing capital which has been amassed in iniquitous ways. The main measures are based on the economy's structural perestroyka aimed at sharply increasing the mass of goods and services. Equitable conditions are envisaged for enterprises of different forms of ownership, as well as increased control over the movement of goods to the consumers and the licensing of exports of raw materials and semimanufactures. Of course, law-enforcement organs must also wage an uncompromising struggle against slick operators in the "shadow economy."

Comments on Economy

LD1412161289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 14 Dec 89

[Excerpt] Special program: At the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies. Andrey Nikiforov is at the microphone.

[Nikiforov] Good afternoon, dear comrades. As you already know, the discussion of the report made yesterday by Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov at the congress is being held in three sections today. I will remind you that one section is examining the measures for making the country's economy healthier, in the second section deputies are discussing the stages of economic reform, and I will speak in more detail about the work of the third

section where basic approaches to the formation of the 13th 5-Year Plan are being examined.

The section's meeting is attended by 707 deputies. Yuriy Dmitriyevich Maslyukov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Planning Committee, is invited from the government to give relevant clarifications and to answer questions. At the very beginning of the meeting it was noted that the section is not expected to work out solutions, but it should give its recommendations to the congress on the issue under discussion. All the ideas and proposals that will be voiced by deputies today will be forwarded to the Plan and Budget Commission of the Supreme Soviet, and its chairman Viktor Grigoriyevich will present information on behalf of the section at the congress tomorrow.

First, Comrade Maslyukov was given the floor. Here is an excerpt from his speech.

[Begin Maslyukov recording] I would only like to single out some points, comrades, for us to better understand each other, points of principle which, indeed, have a great effect on our future activity. First, we said that the structure of the national economy in all its spheres needs the most thorough revision and a shift towards mankind.

I will not speak very much about this, but I will say that the issues of food, consumer goods, and the development of the social sphere, both in town and village, are regarded as of paramount importance. This implies very serious structural changes; this means that we are paying less attention to industry, in all its aspects, and that we are practically putting on ice the fuel and power complex. The social sphere alone needs an additional 110 million tons of standard fuel. This is a very big task, and what is more, the related structure alone will need 215 million tons. To extract them, a very large sum of finances should be invested in this industry.

But in this case, comrades, our goal is not to divide capital investments; our task is to determine priorities correctly, because later—after the priorities have been approved, after the congress has agreed with the fact that the economy should have a precisely social orientation, and that this should not be done to the detriment of all the industries, but that what I have mentioned must be fulfilled—only after that, comrades, will we be able to study in detail all the issues of distributing capital investments, distributing resources, and all the issues related to the procedure for these matters, only after that.

We have neither the grounds nor the estimates to say today that a certain industry should be given more or fewer funds, that power engineering should be given a certain amount, culture a certain amount, agriculture a certain amount, combine harvester building a certain amount, and so on and so forth in all the industries. They exist so far only on a macro-level and they confirm these options.

The second point. The issues of making the situation in the country healthier—I mean the financial and economic situation—the issues of the structural reconstruction of the national economy and the issues of the economic reform—these issues cannot be separated from each other. It is a single system of measures, which gradually changes from one state into another, but it encompasses all these spheres in parallel.

Further, speakers have already mentioned that centralized planning ought to be described in a more clear-cut way in the existing report. I thought that it was described very well there, but I would like to stress one fact. One will have to choose absolutely definitely the future ratio between groups A and B, depending on the path of development we are going to choose. This is precisely the core of state planning—that is, [determining] the main things that should be done and in what groups of industrial development. One should promote the development of tasks set at the first stage of reform through levers of directive planning and at the second stage through economic levers.

Further, comrades, we paid a good deal of attention in the report, and I would like to confirm this once again, to the issues of efficiency. The figures that were given are extremely difficult. Therefore, material consumption should be reduced by 5%, whereas we have worked at a level of 3 to 4%. The power intensity of national income should be reduced by 12-13%, whereas we have always worked at a level of 9-10%, and the material consumption of national income should be at a level of 20%, whereas we work at a level of 11% today. So these are colossal tasks. All the efforts of our scientific and technical potential and our enterprises are needed here—industrial and agricultural enterprises and all others—as this concerns literally all of them.

I would like to draw your attention to the next point. Very tough measures —you have noticed this in the report, it is the issue of distribution and our investment process—are aimed at turning the task in such a way as to stop burying resources in the ground. Why do we lack resources? Because each year the amount of half-finished projects increases by R15 billion, 20 billion, or 30 billion in our country. This means that we have paid wages, buried metal, cement, timber, and the rest, have not received any output, and, as a result, have not attained the required set efficiency, thereby lowering the people's living standards. Therefore, the measures that are envisaged are fairly tough ones, and I would ask you to study them very attentively.

Further, there is an issue requiring a good deal of attention—I would like to learn your view, too, and we will be listening very attentively. This is the issue of combining, in a harmonious way, market relations with regulation by the state. We put the question in precisely the following way: transition from regulation by the state to market relations, but not market relations reigning supreme and starting from tomorrow, as some deputies think. That is, without regulation by the state we will not

be able to get out of this grave situation. Such is the government's categorical view, and we would ask you to lend your support and to speak more definitely on this subject. [end recording] [passage omitted]

Congressional Body Discusses Economic Plan

LD1412132689 Moscow TASS in English 1220 GMT 14 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 14 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

Over 700 people's deputies in the congressional working group "On the Chief Approaches to Elaborating the Plan for 1991-1995" have focused on the government's economic priorities for the next five years.

Chairman of the State Planning Committee (Gosplan) Yuriy Maslyukov stressed the need for major structural changes in the economy to implement a vast social programme. He said the social sphere must receive priority over investment in industry which has to be frozen or slashed.

The government believes, the Gosplan leader said, that its proposed measures can get the economy out of its present predicament.

The ensuing discussion showed many deputies to be in agreement with the government position. The proposal to cut investment in the fuel and energy complex and some of the principal industries came in for scathing criticism.

Ukrainian Premier Vitaliy Masol even said this would defeat the implementation of the social programme and urged "reasonable limits to the cuts being proposed."

Describing the state's agricultural policy as inconsistent, the agrarian deputies demanded absolute priority for the development of the agro-industrial complex.

The discussion has revealed that, regrettably, not all deputies hve heeded the government's request to speak up on the concept of the economic development for the next five-year period and "not to pull the blanket to themselves."

There were repeated calls for increased allocations for science, health care, culture, etc.

The deputies will resume their discussion in the afternoon.

'Scathing Criticism of the Government' Heard

LD1412165589 Moscow TASS in English 1415 GMT 14 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 14 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

Today deputies in the three congressional working groups are discussing the government programme to rebuild the economy. The group "On the Stages of Economic Reform" comprises roughly one third of the number of delegates in each of the two others.

But it was here that the most scathing criticism of the government programme was heard. This may be due to the fact that the document at issue provides for implementing before 1992 a set of emergency measures thought by some deputies to be incompatible with the principles of the economic reform.

Chairman of the parliamentary Committee on Economic Reform Valentin Vologzhin described the concept of transition to the market as the weakest point in the government programme. The definition of market therein is, in his opinion, vague and unconvincing, with no dates or methods of transition to it spelled out.

"The concept of economic reform," Vologzhin said, is not backed up by legal norms.

Economist Pavel Bunich and lawyer Anatoliy Sobchak sharply criticised the government programme. They said the emergency measures give one no certainty about the eventual liberation of the economy and transition to the market.

The programme, they said, contains no mechanism to implement the stages of the reform. Many fundamental laws designed to facilitate its implementation, such as those on property and land, have yet to be adopted. The deputies said that the very substance of the adopted law on leasing is reduced to nought: the share of leasing enterprises will be a mere 20% by 1995.

Pavel Bunich sees this as open resistance to reform by the ministries. In his opinion, the government programme offers no concept for integrating the USSR in the world economy.

To resolve the difficulty, Aleksey Levashov, a scientist from Leningrad, proposed that the rouble be made convertible in the near future, backed by gold, the production of which in the USSR today amounts, in the deputy's words, to around 40% of world gold output.

He suggested that, at the beginning, the release of the convertible rouble into the world market be limited, for instance, to a hundred billion a year.

Unlike this group, the other two, discussing measures to improve the economy and the next five-year plan, are mostly supportive of the government programme although, speakers have submitted many constructive suggestions.

This afternoon all the three groups will continue their deliberations.

Ryzhkov, Vorotnikov Debate Economy 14 Dec

LD1412122789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 14 Dec 89

[Report on the Second Congress of People's Deputies by Vladimir Korablev from the Kremlin]

[Text] I'd like to remind you that today the people's deputies are working in three sections, which are debating questions of measures for improving the Soviet economy, as well as (?the stages of) the economic reform and approach in principle to the preparation of the 13th 5-year plan.

I have just returned from the chambers' room of the USSR Supreme Soviet, where the section chaired by Vitaliy Ivanovich Vorotnikov is debating measures for improving the Soviet economy. Apart from the deputies, and there are more than 700 of them taking part in this section, Council of Ministers Chairman Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov and other members of the government are present.

Some 15 people's deputies have already taken the floor; and I'd like to draw your attention to some of their speeches. For instance, Deputy Nazarov, Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic minister of public education—although the debate concerns the issue of measures for improving the Soviet economy—spoke about serious problems of public education in Central Asian republics. He pointed out to the government members that it is necessary to establish a financial fund for the republics of Central Asia, from which benefits can be paid to those without work.

Deputy Dyakov, first secretary of the Astrakhan Oblast party committee, in his speech devoted a great deal of attention to issues of fulfilling the housing program which, in his view, should be adjusted by the government and requires essential amendments. If this is not done, emphasized Deputy Dyakov, the program might not be fulfilled.

Deputy Fedorov, director general of the eye microsurgery scientific and technical complex, in his speech emphasized that only economic independence and the transfer of many enterprises to financial autonomy and leasing can take the economy out of the crisis situation it is in at present. He emphasized that the issue of leasing should lie at the basis of the new 5-year plan.

As you see, the debate on the issues of measures for improving the economy is evolving into a heated discussion. This is also confirmed by the speech by People's Deputy Bresis, chairman of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers. He noted that one of the important tasks for the fulfillment of all our plans is first and foremost to put the material and technical supply for the country's economy in order. The second most important problem, according to Deputy Bresis, is that the success of the economic independence of the Baltic republics can only be guaranteed on the condition that all enterprises are placed under these republics' national economies. In his speech Deputy Bresis also devoted much attention to issues of foreign trade activity, where we still have a great many unsolved problems. One of these is that we are still not interested in earning hard currency and to solve this problem we must establish a hard currency fund which would, above all, make it possible to get the people interested.

Practically every deputy's speech has raised the entire complex of issues connected with the country's socioeconomic development and a search for new, more effective ways of taking the economy out of the crisis situation.

The section's work goes on and in our news programs we will keep you informed about the speeches of people's deputies discussing these issues.

Vorotnikov Chairs Debate

LD1412195989 Moscow TASS in English 1913 GMT 14 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 14 TASS—Critical remarks, controversial approaches and constructive polemics accompanied the businesslike and relatively quiet discussion of problems today at the Congress of People's Deputies working group dealing with measures to stabilise the economy.

Nikolay Travkin, a famous construction worker, said the government's economic policy was losing its radicalism.

In his opinion, this is due to pressure from forces opposed to perestroyka. Travkin called for new thinking in economic policy.

"This means to acknowledge that commodity, money and market are not capitalist, but universal human values," he pointed out.

Valentin Mesyats, first secretary of the Moscow regional party committee, sees great potentialities in tranferring branches to cost-accounting predominantly on lease terms.

All deputies who spoke at the working group backed the social orientation of economic development for the coming years.

In the opinion of the chairperson of the parliamentary committee for women's affairs, Valentina Matvienko, the government programme does not reach down to the family. "All economic difficulties hit the family the hardest," she emphasised.

"What can the family expect in the next five years? The government programme does not answer this question," Matvienko suggested working out a system of radical social reforms.

Thirty-seven deputies spoke at the sitting, most approved of the government measures to stabilise the economy.

Summing up the debate, the chairman of the sitting, Politburo member and president of the Presidium of the Russian Federation's Supreme Soviet Vitaly Vorotnikov said that the working group had a thorough discussion of issues related to economic improvement and fulfilled its task.

Congress Debates Economic Reform

Abalkin Comments

LD1412203989 Moscow TASS in English 2000 GMT 14 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 14 TASS—More than 30 lawmakers spoke today at the section of the Congress of People's Deputies which debated prospects for the economic reform. They expressed sometimes diametrically opposed options.

"We are still prisoners of the Stalinist economic system, and the key question is how to wrest ourselves from it," said Vladimir Chernyakov, an economist from Kiev.

"The set of extraordinary measures proposed by the government prevents us from doing this, since it preserves the system, under which it is unprofitable to work well," he alleged.

"We may criticise the government programme, but it is better if we supplement and improve it," said Yuriy Meshcheryakov, a party leader from Kazakhstan.

Noting that viewpoints on the present state of the economy are coming closer in society, he said that this trend was reflected in the government programme. Meshcheryakov supported proposed measures to change the investment policy in favour of the social sphere.

This position was backed by some other speakers. At the same time some deputies expressed caution about the concept of market, as proposed by the government.

"A market, even if a socialist one, remains a market with all its negative traits: unemployment, inflation and uncertainty about the future," said Karatay Turysov, a deputy from trade unions. He called for holding a country-wide referendum on this question and only after it to adopt a law on ownership.

Vadim Nikolaychuk, mine manager from the city of Norilek situated within the Arctic Circle, heavily criticised the government programme, saying that the congress should not approve it at all, since it would interfere with adopting laws on ownership, land and local self-government.

He suggested that the congress should only take into consideration the report by the Soviet Government head.

Replying to critics of the government programme, Deputy Prime Minister Leonid Abalkin, member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, said that, while drafting a new concept, some should not think that they have a blank sheet of paper before them.

They should take into consideration the real situation, he added. If the country does not restore the material and value balance in the economy, all other, even the most sweeping, measures will be useless. This is the prime cause for the extraordinary measures proposed by the government, he stressed.

Abalkin said that the market economy is necessary. It is quite another thing that it is impossible to introduce such economy by a decree. Therefore, it will take at least three years to switch to it.

A swifter pace of changes would bring about mass unemployment, bankruptcy of thousands of enterprises and a drop in living standards. It is highly improbable that society will agree to pay such a price, he noted.

The deputy prime minister called on deputies to approve the government programme.

Deputies Analyze Economic Reform Progress

PM1512104189 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 5 Dec 89 p 1

[L. Telen report: "Through the Prism of Reform"]

[Text] A section discussing the problems of economic reform was at work in the Great Kremlin Palace yesterday.

"It's all very well talking about reform, but the work must get done," current affairs writer Anatoliy Agranovskiy wrote back in the sixties, and he was right in his own fashion. Perhaps the time has now come to rephrase his aphorism: It's all very well talking about work, but reform must be implemented. In any case, this was the essential idea running through speeches by many of the deputies who took part in the "reformers" section's work.

It was there that the report presented by the government was subjected to a strict analysis, and it was there that two irreconcilable positions clashed. Advocates of the first demanded that a bridge to reform be built on a new foundation; advocates of the second deemed it possible to use the old foundation.

There were, of course, also points of contact. In any event, deputies did agree on one point: The government had done some colossal work and had really elaborated emergency measures. The extent to which they are feasible and effective is a different matter.

The path chosen by the government is absolutely correct. It is even necessary to boost a number of administrative levers, according to Mikhail Kushnerenko. And he was backed by some deputies.

On the other hand, many of the economists and members of parliamentary commissions and committees who spoke at the sitting evaluated the report as insufficiently radical.

The government's program lacks an underlying foundation; that was the view expressed by Anatoliy Sobchak. After all, the main questions of economic perestroyka—the problem of ownership, land, and demarcation of the powers of republics and the center—have not been resolved to this day, while a series of fundamental draft laws are still at the discussion stage. Indeed, if we were to decide the question in favor of private ownership tomorrow, it would be possible to implement recovery measures of one sort. If the decision went against, the measures would be of a different nature...

One of the main complaints against the report was that it failed to present an economic mechanism for the transitional period. As long as this mechanism is lacking, the program will remain nothing but a declaration. This was said by Anatoliy Sobchak, Aleksey Levashev, and Pavel Bunich.

If we decide to embark on emergency measures, P. Bunich declared, we must be sure that the tree of economic reform will grow at the same time. Otherwise, in around 2-3 years, we will arrive at another crisis and will find out that we have no means to settle the bills presented by the transitional period. Meanwhile, in the famous economist's opinion, hopes for a headlong development of reform are extremely slim. It is hard to argue with him: The government expects to transfer only 20% of enterprises to lease working in the next 6 years.

The question of enterprises' rights was raised in particular. The government has lost sight of this particular link in the economy, speakers in the debate remarked. The danger is understandable: Enterprises' freedom will be significantly curtailed during the era of "emergency measures"; but when will this era come to an end? Are there any guarantees that the administrative system will not exact revenge for past reformist attitudes? So far, there is an obvious shortage of such guarantees.

V. Vologzhin, chairman of the Committee for Economic Reform Questions, made the following proposal. The complete package of economic laws must be adopted in 1990 so that they can all come into force as of 1 January 1991. It is intolerable to put this off for 2-3 years, Vologzhin emphasized, and many of his colleagues backed him.

As part of the program measures, Anatoliy Sobchak proposed an immediate and large-scale land reform, as well as temporary relief of agricultural producers from taxes. He also deems it necessary to make the USSR State Bank subordinate to the Supreme Soviet and thus make the money supply monitorable by deputies. At the same time, the savings regime in the state apparatus ought to be made tougher.

Aleksey Levashev upheld the idea of a convertible ruble on the basis of its gold equivalent. Pavel Bunich insisted on immediate discussion of draft laws on leasing in union republics...

In short, readers can see for themselves that criticism on this occasion was coupled with highly constructive proposals. The section will adopt its resolution at the end of the day and will submit it to the congress tomorrow.

More on Discussion of Economic Plan

LD1412201489 Moscow TASS in English 1918 GMT 14 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 14 TASS—Support for the principles and sharp criticism of individual provisions of the government approach is one way to describe the results of today's discussion by the congressional working group on the plan of economic development for 1991-1995.

Most delegates approved of the structural changes in the economy, proposed in the government's report, to permit implementation of a vast social programme. They also approved the idea of redistributing investment between the various spheres of the national economy. Doubts were expressed, however, about the feasibility of a sharp reduction in industrial investment.

The agrarian deputies gave perhaps the most critical assessment of government views. They accused the Council of Ministers of ignoring the needs of the agrarian sector and demanded more money.

The speeches of most deputies were businesslike and constructive. Supporting the government on the need to maintain state planning, Aleksandr Orlov, director of a trade union school in Chelyabinsk, said the system of planning must concern itself only with maintaining the strategic proportions of the economy.

In the opinion of economist Nikolay Petrakov, the government programme contains some positive elements but is not sufficiently radical on investment policy. He believes that in the coming years the construction of any industrial projects must be frozen. This will substantially reduce uncompleted construction which continues to grow and aggravate inflation processes.

Speaking toward the close of the evening session, First Deputy Premier Yuriy Maslyukov said the discussion was useful for further work on the draft five year plan.

The results of the discussion will be reported to the plenary session on Friday.

14 Dec Panel Discussions Described

LD1512071989 Moscow TASS in English 2021 GMT 14 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 14 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

Participants of the Second Congress of the People's Deputies continued today discussions of the government report on measures to normalise the country's economy. The report was made on Wednesday by Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov.

Three panels discussed one chapter of the report each: on measures to normalise the economy, on prospects for the country's economic reform, on the concept of the economic development plan for 1991-1995.

The panels that discussed measures to normalise the economy and the draft plan for the next five-year plan attracted most delegates —more than 700 worked in each.

Two hundred people discussed prospects for economic reform. These were mainly opponents of the government concept. Leningrad lawyer Anatoliy Sobchak, Moscow economist Pavel Bunich and some others claimed the concept was unripe and called on deputies to turn the programme down.

The panel also heard arguments in support of the government proposal. "The programme invites criticism, but we'd better avoid dismantling it—we should rather supplement and enrich it than turn it down," a party chief from Kazakhstan Yuriy Meshcheryakov told the deputies.

He said a rapprochement between differing viewpoints on the country's present economic situation was becoming noticeable in society and this found its reflection in the government programme.

Responding to critics, Deputy Prime Minister Leonid Abalkin said one should proceed from realistic assessments in working out a new concept. If the material and cost balance is not restored in the economy, all other, even the most radical measures, will prove senseless, he said. This is what prompted the urgent measures proposed by the government.

A balanced approach prevailed in the discussion. Critical of individual provisions of the government programme, the majority of deputies at the same time stressed the programme's central advantage—it was based on the principle of sensible caution and gradual advancement, capable of averting a social outburst.

Unfortunately, not all the deputies needed the government's request to focus on the discussion of the concept of economic development and view it without parochialism. Calls for bigger allocations for science, health services and culture were repeatedly heard.

At a plenary meeting tomorrow, the congress will sum up the results of panel discussions.

Commentator Approves 'Common Market' Idea

PM1512122189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 1

[E. Gonzalyez's "Publicist's View:" "Palace of Congresses: Working Days: Common Market? There is Something in That"]

[Text] The First Congress discussed this matter. Now it has been raised a number of times again: The short-term economic prospects are more worrying than the long-term. Economists and managers can more or less picture future market relations, but when it comes to what to do now and how to begin the transition to the market there are as many opinions as there are speakers.

How complicated it has all become! Even the awareness of the fact that the longest road begins with the first step does not inspire greater optimism: To take a step in the economy you must first stand up. Deputies met in three sections yesterday to discuss ways of doing that. I went to the section on measures to improve the Soviet economy. There were 726 deputies to discuss that topic.

This does not mean, of course, that the other deputies who were putting their efforts into elaborating the stages of the economic reform or the fundamental approaches to the next 5-year plan were engaged in some kind of second-rate work. I, like any Soviet person, am interested in what the economic market will be like in, say, 5 years' time. But I am more interested in what the consumer market will be like and in just 6 months from now. That is, the ordinary bazaars, stores, canteens, new apartments, kindergarten places, wages, prices, waiting lines....

Unfortunately, the consumers' interest is gradually becoming increasingly recreational, as it were, and contemplative and increasingly less creative. There is even the suspicion that nothing will help any more. Quite recently sociologists tried to find out young people's attitude to the problems of shortages and asked: "In your opinion, how many years will it take for the waiting lines to disappear?" Some 28.6% answered "a long time," 33.4% answered "never."

This may be viewed as the background against which the government demonstrated its intentions and chosen means. I wonder how many fewer pessimists there were after N.I. Ryzhkov delivered his report on ways to achieve a healthy economy? Possibly only a new sociological survey could give a precise answer. But the deputies' reaction immediately after the report and during the section meeting give some indication.

Many approved the program as a whole. Almost all gave it qualified approval. On the one hand, they said, the program was clearly produced by knowledgeable specialists; it is realistic, has a systematic character, and addresses some of the problems. But on the other hand, the program is not especially radical. Or rather, it is

radical in the growth of plan figures and cautious on fundamental transformations. And therefore it leaves some problems unresolved.

That, in my view, is a distillation of earlier opinions. It is far harder compressing the proposals—there are too many of them. I shall merely point out the most universal feature: Quite a few deputies noted the shortcomings of the government program and proposed that the way to compensate for them is to use economic freedom—for republics, regions, and individual associations. Things that are risky or people are afraid to do on a national scale can be tried without fuss at local level.

Well, the idea is in the spirit of the times and changes. We are indeed already moving in that direction, and the disputes concerning the remedial properties of republic economic accountability, for example, seem to be dying down. Independence and economic accountability are, of course, a force! But, unfortunately, a centrifugal one. It can stimulate economic development and under certain conditions it can fragment the country into economically accountable entities.

But supposing centripetal forces were to appear with the capacity to unite! At the moment, however, they aren't in evidence. The great common goal has become more remote and somewhat obscured. The idea of selfless fraternity is weakening under pressure from the general shortage. So-called direct links based on attachment, funds, and moreover distribution are more conducive to envy and squabbling than to concord.

So what can be done in practice rather than mere words to unite the republics, oblasts, and zones? And what is it that unites certain countries today? It is movement toward the erosion of borders. A common market.

To be honest, it is strange that in our country, where everything is regarded as a common asset, the market economy and interethnic relations are rarely regarded from that standpoint. Yet it is hard to devise another equally material, long-term, and real interest in the preservation of a single state as a common (or let us call it single) economic market and market relations between the economically accountable regions.

Of course, I have no idea of how this common intraunion market that some deputies timidly mention usually at the end of their speech may look in the flesh. But I am convinced, as they are, that if such a market appeared we would sense an urgent need for the joint management of the economy and a dependence on one another. We shall simply become very necessary to one another.

It goes without saying that this is not a question of copying the well known European Common Market. Indeed, the name itself is used more as a literary device. But the idea of economic integration in conditions of economic accountability, that is with elements of market relations, deserves attention as a cementing factor.

Deputies Criticized for Taking Gorbachev Lead

PM1512123989 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 15 Dec 89 p 1

[Commentary by Prof Vladimir Yadov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Sociology Institute, under the general headline: "Voters at the Television Screen"]

[Text] On the eve of the congress our institute conducted a survey in 12 cities and 10 rural population centers on voters' expectations of it.

The survey inspired hope, despite people's negative assessment of the state of the economy and interethnic relations. So, why the optimism? More than half of the respondents in all the population centers across the USSR where the survey was conducted had a positive attitude to the work of the Supreme Soviet. In other words, it received a vote of confidence from the electorate. A sharply negative opinion on the efficiency of the Supreme Soviet (it has not lived up to the functions expected of it) was voiced by approximately 30% of the respondents in Moscow, Vilnius, and Irkutsk; as much as 40%, which is quite a lot of course, in Tallinn and Tomsk; and a particularly high percentage—more than 60%—in Leningrad Oblast.

You will not believe it, but no more than 15% in various regions did not agree that the congress would be successful: in Vilnius—11%; in Kiev—11%; in Leningrad—14%; in Tallinn—9%; and in Moscow—5%. The remainder either believed that the congress would be a success (an average of approximately 40%) or had doubts about this (as much as 30%). So, the congress has a credit of trust.

My own observations on the first day of the congress' work somewhat diminished the optimism inspired by the opinion poll. I was most impressed by one point where M.S. Gorbachev weakened for a moment, appeared to lose control, and said in his usual measured tones (it must be said that his calm and self-restraint make an exceptional impression) that it had been proposed to discuss the question of the congress standing orders immediately after the report by the Mandate Commission—that is, before N.I. Ryzhkov's report on measures to improve the economy. In other words, the most important problem to be discussed by the congress. The overwhelming majority—two-thirds—voted to change the agenda before Ryzhkov's report. At this point, M. Gorbachev stared in surprise at the display panel—clearly he had not expected the vote to go this way, and it was already the end of the sitting—and asked whether the deputies had understood what they were voting for. An answering hubbub came back from the auditorium. It was quite incomprehensible why the auditorium had become so emotional. The chairman spent quite some time ascertaining the reasons. Then he clearly and distinctly explained what was at issue. When the deputies had appreciated the chairman's position and a repeat vote was held, the decision taken earlier was canceled—also by an overwhelming majority of votes.

The moral of the story is this: The majority follow the chairman's lead. Is this good or bad? I think this incident unequivocally shows that many deputies are still not really tuned into the congress' work.

Gorbachev Meets With Deputies 14 Dec

PM1512115789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Dec 89 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Meeting at CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] M.S. Gorbachev and N.I. Ryzhkov had a meeting at the CPSU Central Committee 14 December with USSR people's deputies working in the agro-industrial sphere.

There was an active exchange of opinions. Many interesting, substantive suggestions were made on problems of life in the countryside and on resolving the vital tasks of providing the country with food.

Many comrades shared their thoughts and experience of work on developing new production relations in the agro-industrial complex and more actively promoting the achievements of scientific and technical progress in all components of the production, processing, and selling of output. The participants in the meeting posed sharply the questions of resource provision and the development of agriculture in the plan for 1990 and the coming 5-year plan.

A number of criticisms were leveled at central ministries and departments and local organs in connection with the realization of the priority approach to the agrarian sector, the fuller utilization of the potential of all forms of economic management, and the social development of the countryside.

The meeting was addressed by V.A. Starodubtsev, I.A. Sumarokov, M.V. Spiridonov, Z. Beyshekeyeva, I.N. Shundeyev, A. Abdurakhimov, I.Kh. Rayg, B.Ye. Yulin, N.A. Polikarpov, A.P. Aydak, D.K. Motornyy, V.V. Khmura, M.M. Safin, A.A. Nikonov, G.I. Stoumova, N.N. Vorobyev, A.E. Kauls, D.Ye. Pletenetskiy, A.D. Menshatov, V.A. Zubanov, A.I. Dubko, and others.

Ye.K. Ligachev and Ye.S. Stroyev participated in the meeting. It was attended and addressed by V.V. Nikitin, I.S. Belousov, and P.I. Mostovoy, deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers; and A.F. Veprev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Agrarian Questions and Food.

The leaders of ministries and departments answered numerous questions from USSR people's deputies.

M.S. Gorbachev spoke in conclusion.

Further on Meeting

LD1512072489 Moscow TASS in English 2050 GMT 14 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 14 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov met today people's deputies from the agro-industrial field. The meeting took place in the offices of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee.

A lively discussion was held, and many interesting and promising proposals were voiced concerning problems of rural life and ways to solve the pressing issue of ensuring food supplies to the population.

Many deputies spoke about their experience in promoting new production relations in the agro-industrial area and their ideas for making effective use of scientific and technical achievements in every phase of producing, processing, storing and distributing agricultural products.

Participants were frank in raising questions concerning the provision of resources and the development of agriculture as envisaged in the plans for 1990 and the forthcoming five-year plan period.

They criticized federal ministries and departments, and local authorities. Critical remarks were connected with the realization of the priority approach towards the agrarian sector, the fuller use of the potential of various forms of economic management and the social improvements in rural areas.

The heads of ministries and departments responded to numerous questions of people's deputies.

Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev spoke in conclusion.

More on Gorbachev, Uoka 12 Dec Congress Exchange

LD1512092489 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 12 Dec 89

[Exchange of remarks between Mikhail S. Gorbachev, chairman on the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and People's Deputy Kazimeras K. Uoka, at the USSR Congress of People's Deputies 12 December afternoon session in the Kremlin Congress of Palaces—recorded]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] [Deputy Uoka] Esteemed deputies, I will speak in moral categories.

[Gorbachev] Introduce yourself.

[Uoka] Deputy Uoka, Kazimeras, from Lithuania. It was said at the assembly and conference of representatives yesterday that we must wait, that the federation will yet reveal its advantages and that, ultimately, all republics will be satisfied. But we in Lithuania think that we acceded—the conditions of the accession are still being studied, the commission on the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact has yet to clarify whether it was an accession or an occupation—but let us assume that Lithuania acceded to

the USSR. Then, at the assembly and conference of representatives yesterday there was obviously an attempt to substitute the Union for the state, an attempt to substitute the federation. The federation and the Union are not it: We consider ourselves a sovereign state and reserve that right for ourselves. And if we are talking about trust, then that trust does not exist, forgive me.

How can we bring it here? The Lithuanian delegation represents the culture of millennia of one of the peoples of this large Union, and we cannot put that culture at risk. One small lie has happened right now, here in this hall—over a trifle, but we cannot show trust, because of that lie as well. It was reported today that, because of the illness of Lithuanian President Astrauskas, he could not be present here, and that I was sitting in the presidium in his place because of that. No, he was present. He was sitting here in the hall until lunch. He wasn't ill at all.

Comrade Gorbachev was simply too modest to state that the Lithuanian government at present is not democratically elected, and the Lithuanian delegation, which was elected democratically, now stands between it and Moscow. The delegation simply did not trust the Lithuanian president—he lost at the elections, he was not elected democratically. If there are lies over such trifles, how can we be trusting over big matters? The Lithuanian delegation will not participate in any way in the elections of this constitutional committee and will, probably, not recognize it.

[Gorbachev] Fine. I think that the question regarding how we used the information concerning Comrade Astrauskas' illness—incidentally, that cause was given at the conference of representatives yesterday, and there...

[Lukyanov interrupting] It was given.

[Gorbachev] It was given. No, no, no, comrades! I received that yesterday, it was heard yesterday, and nobody refuted it, nor did they today, and nobody sent anything. Well, in general, let us look into who gave the information to us—to us saying that is how things were. Incidentally, he wasn't in the presidium. Yes, there is something here. If I were in comrade Uoka's place, I wouldn't be in a hurry to make such accusations of lying. That is going too far, and I think he should think a bit about his conclusions and assessments. [passage omitted]

Lithuanian Deputies Appeal Conflict

LD1512000689 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 14 Dec 89

[Text] According to the Sajudis Information Agency, MP's elected from Lithuania have distributed an appeal among the political and public movements of the Soviet Union, saying that the conflict between the Congress and the Lithuanian MP Kazimeras Uoka took place because Moscow constantly tries to arrange the affairs of Lithuania bypassing the opinion of the Lithuanian MPs elected in truly democratic elections.

Gorbachev Meets With Lithuanian Deputies

LD1412234689 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 14 Dec 89

[Text] The Second Congress of the Supreme Soviet [as heard] of the USSR continues its work in Moscow. This day was of great importance to Lithuania because a meeting between the Lithuanian parliamentarians and Mikhail Gorbachev took place in his office in the Central Committee of the Soviet Union.

Professor Prunskene, deputy prime minister of Lithuania, Professor Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian reform movement Sajudis, Romualdas Ozolas, vice chairman of the Sajudis, and also Comrade Gudaitis, member of the Council of Sajudis Seimas, participated in the meeting.

Mr Gorbachev expressed his support to the economic self-management idea, which will be put into practice from the beginning of next year. He also agreed with the idea of an economic corridor uniting the Baltics and which will act as a kind of a transit zone between the East and West. Mr Gorbachev did not oppose the wish of the Lithuanians for a greater constitutional independence. He also said that the political and economic system of the Soviet Union should be radicalized.

Further on Meeting

LD1512112689 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0800 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Excerpts] Lionginas Vasiliauskas, Sajudis accredited correspondent in Moscow, reports: [passage omitted on Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies]

Yesterday a group of the USSR People's Deputies from Lithuania—Professor Vytautas Landsbergis, Romas Gudaitis, a writer, Kazimiera Prunskiene, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Lithuanian SSR, and Romualdas Ozolas, editor-in-chief of the newspaper ATGIMIMAS [REBIRTH] met with Mikhail Gorbachev. The meeting took place at the Central Committee of the CPSU. Questions concerning the future development of the economy of the Soviet Union and that of Lithuania, questions concerning the armed forces, their status and military service in Lithuanian young men, as well as constitutional conflicts were discussed at the meeting.

Perhaps the main conclusion would be this: that although Gorbachev understands our aspirations very well, he finds it difficult to support such proposals as that constitutions should first be adopted in the Union republics and only then on the basis of these either All-Union contracts should be made or the All-Union Constitution should be formulated.

Gorbachev became very interested in the questions which concerned the Army because in a meeting a day ago with Yazov, the defense minister, took place during which negative answers were categorically given to all

the proposals made by our deputies. In other words he [Yazov] refused to discuss the possibility of setting up national military formations so that the Lithuanian young men can do their military service in Lithuania or at least in the Baltic countries. So, Gorbachev paid special attention to this and the prognosis can be made that a solution of those issues will begin to move if Gorbachev marked them down in his notebook—this is how Romas Gudaitis put it.

Here is one pleasant remark: the conversation was rather cordial; Mikhail Gorbachev is an educated man. Indeed, he would not dare express himself the way Yazov said to Professor Landsbergis: Don't think we know nothing about your parentage.

Estonian Delegate Complains About Coverage

PM1512102789 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Dec 89 First Edition p 1

[Interview with Deputy Yevgeniy Vladimirovich Kogan, member of the CPSU and head of an "Estrybprom" Association laboratory, by unnamed KRASNAYA ZVEZDA parliamentary correspondents: "Protagonists: Deputy Kogan"; date and place of interview not specified; first three paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] Yevgeniy Vladimirovich Kogan. Born 1954. Member of the CPSU. Head of an "Estrybprom" Association laboratory. Well known in Estonia as one of the organizers and leaders of Interdvizheniye [International Movement].

He has no shortage of opponents and critics. But here is a typical detail. In the election he beat one of the leaders of the People's Front, whose supporters were victorious in virtually all the republic's electoral okrugs. On the first day of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies Kogan spoke about glasnost in the work of the Congress. Why?

The KRASNAYA ZVEZDA parliamentary correspondents began their conversation with him with this question.

[Kogan] A matter of principle. At the last Supreme Soviet session I took the floor on four occasions. None of my speeches were shown on television, for some reason. In addition there was the question of why my speeches were not shown in the television relays. But I simply received no answer to these questions.

Thus, I repeat, this is a matter of principle. The First Congress was broadcast live. The second has been recorded. This is normal in principle but I am afraid that, just as at the session, someone may be able to go to work with the scissors here. That was my rejoinder on the first day.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] But you would agree that deputies are often rightly reproached for their attempts to, so to speak, get back on screen again. There is a reason for this.

[Kogan] I agree. But this is different. All my speeches were dictated by one desire—the desire to talk about what is now happening in Estonia... Or rather, not even that, to describe the forces which are seeking primacy for one nation alone—the indigenous nation. That is against all the norms of international law, the norms of humanism and morality. Incidentally, my voters also share that opinion. So you must not perceive populist motives in my speeches. They reflect reality.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Well then, reality. How does it manifest itself for your voters now?

[Kogan] I have already begun to answer this question. But as yet I have only revealed the trends. Now a word about facts. Take the 10 December local soviet elections. They were held on the basis of the new republic law which introduced residence qualifications. If you recall, the union Supreme Soviet Presidium ruled that some articles of this law did not accord with the USSR Constitution and our international legal commitments. But the republic's parliament did not deem it necessary to rescind its decision and only temporarily renounced the application of the residence qualification for voters. But take the establishment of electoral okrugs—"privileges" for the indigenous population could clearly be discerned here. We conducted a special study. Could we hush up such facts?

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] You called for a boycott of the election...

[Kogan] Interdvizheniye did. I must elaborate. It was not only Interdvizheniye but also the United Council of Labor Collectives, which includes Russian-speaking enterprises, and the Council of Armed Forces Veterans and Internationalist Soldiers. Certainly, I forgot to mention the involved system of determining the election results whereby votes could be manipulated and given to other candidates... That could not fail to put us on our guard. So our call for a boycott was not extremism on the part of individual "internationalists," as people in the republic are trying to present it. It represents a struggle for our rights. We won support. Less than half the electorate voted in two rayons in Tallinn mainly inhabited by workers. The election will have to be held again. To be specific, more than 150,000 people failed to turn up at the electoral wards.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Yevgeniy Vladimirovich, who will defend their interests in local self-management bodies?

[Kogan] Elections must be held on the basis of the USSR Constitution. Then people will take part in them. So we should contemplate holding an alternative elections. Based on the union Constitution.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] This option has no shortage of opponents. In particular, it was sharply criticized by USSR people's deputies from Estonia. How are your relations with your colleagues?

[Kogan] Previously, some people simply did not pass the time of day with me. You would greet a man once, twice, three times and meet with silence. Do you really think that's possible? It's understandable that he doesn't agree with my position. But that's out of line. Dialogue has begun nonetheless now — on the sly, cautiously, but it has begun.

Admittedly one deputy recently said that people are saying: We will think about what to do with Kogan when an Estonian republic is formed.

I will treat that as a joke. But if it was serious, I know for sure what I want: The rights of my voters must be upheld. That is why I came to the Congress.

Credentials of Additional Deputies Recognized

PM1412145189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Dec 89 Second Edition p 1

[Resolution under general heading "Congress of USSR People's Deputies Resolutions": "On Recognition of Credentials of USSR People's Deputies Elected Since First Congress"]

[Text] The Congress of USSR People's Deputies, having examined the report of the Credentials Commission, decrees in accordance with Article 110 of the USSR Constitution that:

The credentials of the following USSR People's Deputies be recognized

Dmitriy Vasilyevich Pavlychenko, elected from the Kalushskiy Terrritorial Electoral Okrug No 461, 15 October 1989;

Petr Kupriyanovich Prishchepa, elected from the Dubnovskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug No 510, 29 October 1989;

Nikolay Mikhaylovich Chepelev, elected from the Sokulukskiy National-Territorial Electoral Okrug No 342, 15 October 1989;

Mintimer Sharipovich Shaymiyev, elected from the Menzelinskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug No 389, 9 July 1989;

Yuriy Petrovich Shchekochikhin, elected from the Leninskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug No 413, 27 October 1989.
[Signed] M. Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet.
Moscow, Kremlin, 13 December 1989.

Yakovlev Chairs 1939 Pact Review Meeting

LD1412225189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 14 Dec 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Today a sitting of the commission for political and legal appraisal of the Soviet-German nonaggression treaty of 1939 has taken place. Comrade Yakovlev was in the chair. The materials which the commission would submit for discussion at the USSR Congress Peope's Deputies were agreed. It was decided that the chairman of the commission would give a report on its work. The sitting was held in an atmosphere of constructive cooperation of the people's deputies.

Political & Social

Deputies Discuss Possible Political Opposition

LD1412211489 Belgrade TANJUG in English 2020 GMT 14 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, Dec 14 (TANJUG)—An Inter-Regional Group of Deputies met this evening to discuss whether to form a democratic parliamentary faction of people's deputies or a political opposition within the Supreme Soviet, it was learnt this evening.

Some 400 members of the inter-regional group held the meeting during a break in the Second Congress of People's Deputies held at the Kremlin.

During a three-hour debate, the method of work of the groups was not clearly defined for either of the two possibilities.

It has been learnt that both the faction or the opposition would operate as part of the Supreme Soviet, ie. the Soviet parliament, opposing official stands.

Well-informed sources do not rule out the possibility of joining together the two groups, which would then present a single format of radical forces in Soviet parliament.

The inter-regional group is mostly composed of prominent Soviet intellectuals, who have criticized the slow pace of economic and other reforms currently under way in the Soviet Union and the slow transition to a market-oriented economy.

Gorbachev Urged To Concentrate on Supreme Soviet

PM1312130189 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 12 Dec 89 p 1

[Comment by Oleg Kontonistov, first secretary of the Volkhov City All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League Committee, carried under the general heading "What Do We Expect from the Congress? This question Is Answered By a Worker, a Scientist, a Member of an Informal Group, a Military Man... People of Various Views and Convictions"]

[Text] "Article 6 of the Constitution is now being discussed by everyone. But, in my opinion, it cannot be viewed in isolation from the other articles. The Constitution has to be changed as a whole.

"I would like Mikhail Sergeyevich to concentrate his efforts on Supreme Soviet work after the present congress. Gorbachev is, of course, a worthy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. And he was also rightly elected chairman of the Russian Bureau. But one person—even the finest—must not be made to shoulder the whole burden. Moreover, while he remains the number one person in the party, he does in some way or another come under the influence of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo. But it is essential that the determining influence on the head of state should be that of deputies elected by the people.

"It is possible that when other political parties emerge in our country the combining of the posts of general secretary and chairman of the Supreme Soviet will no longer be a problem."

Readers Find Gorbachev 'Too Liberal,' 'Familiar'

PM1412151389 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 14 Dec 89 p 1

[Comments from editorial phone-in feature: "Telephone on 'PRAVDA Street.' Number One Man"]

[Text] "Why doesn't Comrade Gorbachev wear a deputy's badge?" (M. Tarkhanov, Kiev)

"Gorbachev plays the liberal too much with his opponents. A leader should defend his position, regardless of any objections." (P. Terlishchenko, Omsk)

"Gorbachev should be more restrained. He should be less familiar. And the Supreme Soviet apparatus would do well not to "push forward" the president as they did in the case of electing the congress Presidium. Surely everyone understands that a 'casual' attitude will no longer do?" (A. Polyakov, Moscow Oblast)

Poll Shows Most Favor Economic Reform

PM1412153189 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 13 Dec 89 p 2

[Article by own economic observer P. Voshchanov under the "Parliamentary Debate" rubric: "Poor Old Private Ownership: The All-Union Public Opinion Study Center Has Completed a Piece of Unique Research"]

[Text] Who is to be in charge of property? Who is to be its sole owner? Not so long ago these issues only worried specialists. Today they are debated in worker collectives and student lecture theaters and at rallies. But how is one to understand all the diversity of standpoints? It is no easy matter! Particularly as, in confirmation of the verities of the most diverse platforms, the same counter-argument is often proclaimed, namely: "This is demanded by the people!" Appealing to the people seems to have become an everyday political cliche in our country.

Let's Ask the People

It is interesting that almost everyone who cites the opinion of the people is sincerely convinced that he knows what our people actually want and expect! One may encounter examples of such presumption everywhere, ranging from rallies, which have become a customary feature of our life, to a responsible session of the country's Supreme Soviet. Indeed, during the debate on the Law on Ownership the expression "the people" was probably manipulated a record number of times.

Developing the cooperative system? The people are against it! Attracting Western capital into the country? No way! The people will not approve such a step! Leasing, share ownership, the market economy—all this, to judge by certain statements made, is "alien from a class standpoint." Here is just one quotation on this score, taken from a speech by Deputy N. Petrushenko: "Those who think that the people will permit another experiment this time are profoundly mistaken."

The opinion of the people is cited by many nowadays, and often. But on what are all these quotations based? The attitude of relatives, close friends, work colleagues, or even voters in one or two okrugs? But they alone, after all, do not constitute the people! That is why, I think, the following words spoken in parliament by our head of government, N.I. Ryzhkov, contain good sense: But have we asked the people?

So before we cite the people, let us ask them about everything!

What, Then, Did the People Say?

It was with this question that I began my conversation with Doctor of Historical Sciences N. Popov, leader of a problem-solving group at the All-Union Public Opinion Study Center, who, along with Candidate of Economic Sciences S. Shpilko, his colleague and laboratory chief, very quickly clarified the attitude of various strata of our population to the draft Law on Ownership. So, let the specialist speak.

"During the last Supreme Soviet session, when the contest of opinions concerning the Law on Ownership under discussion reached an extremely high pitch, one could indeed quite often hear the appeal 'Let's ask the people!' For some this meant the need to meet and discuss with their electorate, for others the careful study of the deputy's mail. But can one in such a simple way clarify the mass feelings of the population and assess what it supports and rejects in the draft law? Judge for yourselves: Who comes to meetings with deputies and sends them letters and telegrams? The most active voters. But the laws are also written, after all, for those who remain silent, the disillusioned, the indifferent, the skeptical, and the pessimists. They too are a part (and, unfortunately, quite a large part) of the actual people, whose opinion has been so often cited of late. Consequently, they must also be taken into account in a sociological poll.

"What results have been obtained, then? I confess that they refute the idea of our people as being disillusioned with perestroyka, tired of reforms, and reluctant to accept radical economic innovations. The bulk of the people are attracted by the idea of destatization [razgosudarstvleniye] and a transfer to a mixed market mechanism. Ownership of the means of production should be collective or individual—that is the dominant feeling which we detected...

"We asked the question: How do you regard the existence in our country of new economic types of enterprise? And here is how the the answers split up (I should warn you that all the figures have been rendered as percentages of the total number of respondents, but as a result may not yield 100 percent, because those who responded could choose several options simultaneously): [In the following table A equals "Approve," B "Indifferent," C "Disapprove," and D "Don't Know"

A	B	C	D	
Joint-stock enterprises set up with investors' money	55	14	12	19
Enterprises belonging to foreign companies	35	8	37	20
Joint enterprises	71	7	10	12
Cooperative enterprises	36	15	34	15
Enterprises belonging to individual citizens	31	9	42	18
Enterprises belonging to labor collectives	72	10	8	11
Enterprises leased by labor collectives	72	8	9	11

What conclusions may be drawn? There is undoubted support for such forms of economic activity as the lease, collective ownership, and joint ventures. Many find share ownership attractive. At the moment, however, the supporters of the cooperative system and foreign capital still do not predominate.

Now for private ownership. It turns out that its supporters and opponents are approximately equal in number. When a sociological survey produces a result like that it normally asks further questions. We used that method, too. Here is the result. In reply to the question: "Would you allow private property to exist in the USSR?" the answers were as follows:

—56 percent said yes;
—21% said no;
—23% were indifferent.

Our analysis showed that in the main those questioned do not see ideologically colored connotations in the concept of "private ownership" and do not consider its "legalization" to be a deviation from socialism. Where should it be developed? Anywhere except heavy industry—that is the majority opinion. Preference is given to the processing of agricultural produce (around 82% thought that), light industry (67%), medicine (56%), and school education (52%). The opponents of private ownership put forward the thesis of the exploitation of hired labor and think that the people will never accept that. But our research showed a somewhat different picture: A total of 49% of those questioned consider the use of hired labor at private enterprises permissible within certain limits, while 35% are against. The overall result is that 61% believe that the economic situation of the country and the population will be improved by the introduction of private property and only 11% hold the opposite view.

There have been quite a few polls recently on the question of land ownership. Who should be the sole owner of it? Unfortunately, when replying to that question people often cite the "opinion of all the people."

We asked: "Should the land be transferred to individual use? If so, in what way?" The most frequent answer was that people should be allocated land free of charge but without the right to resell it. That is the view of almost 40% of the population. Around 35% are convinced that the state should either sell land to those who want it or give it free of charge without imposing conditions on this. There are other views—intermediate ones, as it were. But most important is surely this: Only 5% of those polled believe that the land should remain in complete state ownership, whereas the majority (76%) are convinced supporters of its return to the peasants.

The population's attitude to existing collective farms [kolkhozes] in the agrarian sphere of our economy has also been clarified. Furthermore, we tried not to put the question "point blank," as it were, so as not to indirectly influence the poll's results. We put the question like this: "What types of farms should be supported and developed in the countryside today?" The results, I think, were very interesting. Around 35% support kolkhozes and state farms [sovkhozes], whereas 72% support cooperative farmers, leaseholders, and independent farmers. The latter were favored by 34%. The supporters of the farmer method [fermerskiy put] included rural inhabitants, city dwellers, workers, and specialists with higher education. What is our assessment of these results? I am convinced that they present an accurate picture of society's feelings today. But only for today. Feelings will change, and very radically, too, as the ideas of the economic and political reform penetrate the mass consciousness increasingly deeply. Our society is gradually emerging from the "lethargy" created by bureaucracy and dogma. And parliamentary debates are helping that to a considerable extent. And I have no doubt that the second Congress of People's Deputies will accelerate those processes still further.

The People—You Are Wrong!

The sociologists have had their say then. But I do not think that they will convince everyone, because only those who want to hear will hear just as only those who want to see will see. That is why I predict the following reaction: The research conducted by the VTsIOM is absolutely wrong. They asked the wrong categories of the

population, they asked the wrong questions, they recorded the wrong answers. To cut a long story short, all their statistics are harmful.

But the Moscow CPSU City Committee and Oblast Committee Sociopolitical Center produced the same results. Here is a report we received from TASS: Some 73% of Muscovites questioned by sociologists react positively to a diversity of forms of ownership and only 5% are opposed.

Some people, when faced with an aroused social consciousness, are ready to proclaim right away: "People—you are wrong!" And they receive support not only from above but below, too. They use that support as an excuse for inaction and try to change the situation in the country so that nothing actually changes.

Why do I think that? Unfortunately, there are grounds for it. As confirmation I shall cite an extract from a letter I received from E. Barsov, chief of the Pskov Oblast Voluntary Society for the Promotion of the Army, Aviation, and Navy shooting and sports club. He writes: "I am ready to volunteer to join armed formations to take part in a civil war against the restoration of private property. I would rather starve than debase myself by material dependence on the owner of private capital." Any commentary needed? I think not. But there will be speakers who will use this line as the basis of their argument—"The people demand!"

But everyone has to decide!

Search for CPSU Deputy To Replace Abalkin Starts

PM0412160189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Nov 89 Second Edition p3

[Unattributed report: "In the CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] In connection with the termination of the authorization of L.I. Abalkin, USSR people's deputy from the CPSU, who has been approved as deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, the Central Electoral Commission for the Election of USSR People's Deputies has arranged the election of a USSR people's deputy from the CPSU to replace L.I. Abalkin. In order to hold the election of a USSR people's deputy from the party, the CPSU Central Committee has formed an electoral commission on the basis of Articles 28 and 62 of the USSR "Law On the Election of USSR People's Deputies" made up of the following people: L.D. Bryzga, V.A. Zatvornitskiy, T.G. Ivanova, V.A. Koptyug, Yu.I. Lobov, P.S. Maksudov, A.M. Fateyev, Yu.S. Shemshuchenko, and A.I. Shitov.

New Moscow Party Chief Promises Openness

PM1312152089 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 49, 3 Dec 89 p 14

[Petr Vilkin report: "Yuriy Prokofyev: The City Party Committee Will Be Open to the Press"]

[Text] At a recent press conference it was announced that, at a Plenary Meeting in the Moscow City Party Committee, Yuriy Prokofyev was elected its new First Secretary. Prokofyev won an absolute majority.

"There'll be no policy statements today," he told journalists. "I can only say that it's been a long time before a person having no experience in running state affairs was elected to this post."

Yuriy Prokofyev then briefed the meeting on the problems facing the Moscow Party organization and answered questions. Concerning the forthcoming elections to the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation and the local Soviets, he said that during the recent general elections mistakes had been made in relations with the press. Now it should be considered "what kind of candidate a person is, rather than whom he or she represents". Without prejudice he spoke about different political organizations, of which there are more than a hundred in Moscow; and said there was nothing wrong with Communists working in these organizations.

During the press conference, Yuriy Prokofyev answered several MN [MOSCOW NEWS] questions.

MN: How often are you going to hold press conferences?

Yu.P.: At least once a month. If necessary, there'll be special meetings with the press. I also believe that besides press conferences we in the Party Committee should make use of the TV and directly communicate with Muscovites.

MN: Do you intend to publish the verbatim reports of the Committee's bureau and plenary meetings?

Yu.P.: I think yes. But they'll be considered in each particular case. Our party affairs are becoming less and less secret. It's absolutely correct that we now declassify Party documents. But where to publish them? Certainly not in MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA. We should not turn the daily into an information bulletin, now that its subscription has already dropped. In fact, we put out an information bulletin in which all interested can find the necessary material, and it can be distributed nationwide through Soyuzpechat.

MN: Do you plan to conduct serious sociological research to study public opinion?

Yu.P.: I think the mistakes made during the elections were mostly due to lack of experience in conducting sociological studies. That's why we had no objective information about society's feelings. The polls we conducted were just amateurish. Now we plan to set up an institute in Moscow which will study public opinion. This institute won't belong to our Party Committee. It will have many sponsors, including the Moscow District Party and Komsomol committees, trade unions, the Academy of Social Sciences and the USSR Academy of Sciences. At first, the institute will be supported by the constituent fund and by circulating assets allocated by us. The institute will probably be located in the House of

Political Education. The Academy of Sciences promised to provide technology, the Moscow City Soviet will also give circulating assets, while the trade unions and the Komsomol, "live" money. This will only be in the beginning. After that the institute will operate on a self-supporting basis, which means that 80 per cent of its research will be done on the sponsors' orders and rest on someone else's.

Prokofyev 25 Nov Moscow Address Reported

90UN0398A Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 26 Nov 89 p 1

[Report by G. Drugoveyko and V. Yevseyev: "Acquaintance and Test"; under the rubric "Yesterday in the Sociopolitical Center of the Moscow City Committee and the Moscow Committee of the CPSU"]

[Text] It was a regular monthly event: The city day of lecturers and propagandists. But if someone would ask us to define the essence of the event in two words, this is what we would have said: an acquaintance and a test.

It was not the only time Yu.A. Prokofyev had spoken before the propagandists' corps of the capital, but it was the first time he had done so in his new capacity as first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom [city committee] of the CPSU. And that, of course, was what gave a special touch to the meeting yesterday.

There is a big difference between the "second" and the "first." It seems that you have to get acquainted anew. One could hear similar comments here and there during side conversations in the center. And it was not unexpected that a remark by Yu.S. Karabasov, secretary of the Moscow Gorkom who opened the meeting, was met with some noise—half serious, half in jest. When he said there seemed to be no need to introduce Yuriy Anatoliyevich Prokofyev, the audience objected: "Introduce him; we do not know him." Who is he, the new leader of Moscow Communists? With what experience did he come to such a responsible position? What is his political credo in general? The atmosphere in the hall seating almost 2,000 was practically electrifying, so great was the desire of the audience to find answers to all these questions.

Yu.A. Prokofyev takes the floor. But we would like to jump ahead and quote his concluding remark uttered, so to speak, "as the curtain fell" after the 4-hour meeting: "You know, I was very tense as I was getting ready for today's appearance." Well, it was a truly serious test he had to take in front of very experienced and competent examiners. His speech lasted 1 ½ hours and his answers to dozens of questions took 2 ½ hours. Not a single one remained unanswered—whether it seemed to be the most insignificant, the most involved, or the most provocative.

A request was made during the meeting to have a complete report of the meeting published in newspapers. There were no objections to that. And we, the editors of MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA, also consider it very important and useful to acquaint everybody, as we say, verbatim, with the dialogue that took place. However, the present limitations of our paper do not make it possible to do so. Maybe this sincere admission will be understood by our publishers, the Moscow Gorkom and Mossovet [Moscow city council], as instructions from journalists and readers to set up a special supplement that will publish complete reports of various meetings and sessions, documents, and decrees that are of special interest for Muscovites today. That would have been good support of glasnost. But so far we must limit ourselves to a short review.

Yu.A. Prokofyev started his speech by analyzing the situation in the country and the party. It should be mentioned here that as Yuriy Anatoliyevich himself emphasized, it was purely his personal evaluation of the many facets of the present situation. And it was that very fact that gave a special, confidential character to the meeting.

What, then, in our opinion was most interesting and most essential in the speech of the first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom? Now we have to put the accents just as we, the journalists, think necessary, because there had been no "approval" or "consideration" of this material at any level. So, here are certain points of his speech which we would like to make known to all the people of Moscow.

"This is the first time in the last few years that the first secretary of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom has come not from 'above,' from the higher-level party organs, but from 'below'—that is, having gone his entire way through the city organizations. This will create certain difficulties in my work. Therefore, I am in extreme need of support. And it is only with the backing of the Muscovites and of Communists that we will be able to solve the complex problems facing the city.

"Perestroyka was unavoidable mainly because we had declared that our party was guided by dialectics, but our actions were guided by dogmas. A lot has been done by now. But not all of our present-day mistakes came from the period of stagnation; we have made many of them ourselves. It happened mainly because we continue to juggle the laws of economics without accepting completely and permanently the objective nature of those laws.

"The processes of perestroyka in the party itself are being deterred by the lack of a political platform in the CPSU Central Committee. We need to have a theoretical and philosophical understanding of the road we are taking. Such a platform should be formulated without delay. The Central Committee should meet much more often during this period which is so tense for the party.

"Regional economic accountability [khozraschet] is not a universal panacea. If we follow along those lines we can end up having a natural economy in separate regions, thus "breaking up" the country into pieces. We need to

have well-thought-out economic relations among the regions, but not isolation. They need to be independent in their expenditures.

"The investment policy in the city must depend on the social needs. We must be firm in our decision not to have any new industrial enterprises in Moscow that would not provide for the needs of the city.

"It is impossible to cure all the ailments of the community in one separate city. But there are two problems in Moscow that we can resolve independently—service and utilities and safeguarding public law and order."

After Yu.A. Prokofyev outlined his point of view on various problems and the tasks of the Communists of the capital resulting from them, he also emphasized another point. According to him we should have a clear understanding of the concept of perestroyka in all spheres of public life and should be active in applying it in reality. He said that we are striving to further the dynamic renewal of the style and methods of our work, to expand the dialogue and cooperation with all constructive forces of our society. All of this becomes especially indispensable during preparation for the elections to the republic and local soviets. The party organization of the city is approaching the elections with a well-defined, balanced, and realistic program for its actions.

After this the time came for a straight dialogue: answers to numerous questions.

Today the public wants to know as much as possible about its leaders, about their life, work, and party experience, about their families, and their apartments. Yuriy Anatoliyevich told a very simple story of his way through the profession toward his present high position. He also spoke of his studying, of his work on his dissertation, and about his family. The Prokofyevs live in Sokolniki in a two-room, 35-square-meter apartment.

Then Yuriy Anatoliyevich answered directly a whole set of questions that dealt with the plenum of the Leningrad CPSU Obkom [oblast committee] and the recent meeting of Leningrad Communists.

The first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom thinks that the CPSU Central Committee is really somewhat passive and uncertain. This is probably due to the absence of a detailed program of actions for this difficult period, and also to the tradition of being executors rather than creators. Therefore, the concern of the Leningraders over the fate of the party is easy to understand. However, the call for an extraordinary session of the party congress may hardly seem constructive. Rather, a different approach seems more reasonable. It is not so much the urgency of the congress that is important, but the depth and solidity of the work that the party forum will have to do. Besides, one must also consider the entire variety of opinions displayed by the Communists on the most crucial problems of party life.

Yuriy Anatoliyevich does not consider extraordinary the demand that the higher level party organs should be held accountable and responsible before those who elected them and who entrusted them with the leadership of the party. In the future he sees the necessity to work out an essentially democratic element on which the main principles of the party's vital activity should be based. Centralism which considerably outbalances the initiative becomes a restraining factor in the development of the party; it limits the diversity of practical experience.

Yu. Prokofyev did not in the least aim his answers at gaining some pre-programmed popularity, although it is obvious to anyone, including him, that the prestige of a first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom is not a personal quality factor. However, the audience was exposed only to the personal convictions of the new leader of the Moscow Gorkom. For instance, Yuriy Anatoliyevich is against using private property as a means of exploitation. He is also against copying foreign ways toward achieving material well-being. We do need to study foreign experience, to interpret it for the conditions in our country, and to implement it after having transformed it to fit the socialist frame. But copying it blindly cannot result in anything good.

The workers movement is gaining strength now. It is a natural phenomenon. Honestly speaking, the working class benefited from perestroyka less than any other social group. So the workers felt that they were ignored, and that caused their political awakening and need of self-definition. It is a difficult stage and the party cannot be standing aside. Let us say that about 50% of those who resigned from the party are workers. What is behind those figures? Do people resign because they joined the party "to fill the quota" or because they become disappointed in it? The gorkom will have to find the answer to that question.

One of the questions sounded somewhat like a reproach: Is the first secretary paying too much attention to economic questions; could that mean a return to the past? Without undue maneuvering Yuriy Anatoliyevich outlined his position. It is impossible to hand over the economic concerns to Mossovet and the rayispolkoms [rayon soviet executive committees] all at once. But already the party organization is focusing more and more on the political methods of leadership in the economy.

A question was also raised about the salary increase for party officials. The answer explained everything. First, the party officials have had no salary increase for a long time, even though the growth of monetary compensation for all categories of employees is a permanent phenomenon. Second, such a decision was adopted owing to the reduction of party personnel—by 30% in the case of the Moscow Gorkom. Third, the money was allocated from the party coffers and not from the state budget. And finally, this step will make it possible to attract the best intellectuals to work for the party. According to Yuriy Anatoliyevich, party work nowadays means in most cases scientific research, psychology, and sociology.

There were no "forbidden" subjects in the course of the dialogue. The propagandists learned what the first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom thought about the popular political figures of Moscow, about the informal groups, and the problem of "limited-term living permits."

Honestly, we journalists liked the meeting. But we wanted to check how accurate our professional feeling was and we went to talk with the participants.

We spoke with lecturers Yu. Bashilov and Ye. Ovchinnikov, college instructors Yu. Gusev and A. Nikitin, and propagandist V. Bayankin. All of them liked the meeting because of the simple atmosphere and sincere answers. Each of them noted how close the opinions of the Moscow Gorkom first secretary were to their own everyday thoughts and ideas. They were pleased by the clarity of positions and the openness of doubts Yu.A. Prokofyev shared with the ideology workers of Moscow.

21 Nov Leningrad Joint Plenum Described

90UN0407G Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 23 Nov 89 p 1

[Report by V. Koshvanets, A. Ozhegov: "Remaining Silent Is Immoral!"]

[Text] Communists, let us lift up our heads and close ranks in the name of socialism! Remaining silent and saying nothing now is immoral! We are breaking emphatically with the ideology of Stalinism, but are convinced that our banner was and remains red. And inscribed thereon is Lenin, October, socialism!

This appeal was not simply heard at the joint plenum of the Leningrad Obkom [oblast party committee] and Gorkom [city party committee] held the day before yesterday, but it also reflected sufficiently accurately the overall tone and essence of the entire preceding discussion. Under the conditions of the worsening political and socioeconomic crisis in the country, the unconcealed offensive against the party, and the incapacity or reluctance of the CPSU Central Committee and its Politburo to take charge of the situation and adopt a clear-cut position on problems which are fateful for socialism, no one who continues to consider himself a communist has the right to remain silent and inactive. The participants in the joint plenum were brought to such conclusions by life itself, and such were the instructions they received, setting off for the Smolnyy, from their work collectives and party organizations.

A sense of Leningrad communists' responsibility for the development of perestroyka on the path of the socialist choice made in October and for the consolidation of all healthy forces of the party and society on a socialist basis also imbued the platform of actions in the period of preparation for the 28th CPSU Congress and the elections to the republic and local soviets of people's deputies adopted by the plenum.

The action platform presupposes action! Not in the stillness of offices, not at over-organized meetings, but directly in the masses, in the square, and on the street, among people losing their bearings under the pressure of antisocialist demagogy.

Remaining silent is immoral! Yesterday, at a multithousand-strong meeting of Leningrad's communists held on the initiative of the party committees of the biggest Leningrad enterprises and which became a logical continuation of the joint plenum, this appeal was put into practice. It may confidently be maintained that neither the square in front of the V.I. Lenin SKK [sports-concert complex], where the meeting was held, nor our city had seen anything like it. The communists showed for all to see that faced with the need to defend and uphold their ideals, the ideals of socialism, they know how to do this passionately, firmly, and with full voice.

A meeting is a meeting and dictates both its particular tone and its vocabulary of expression. And for this reason that which was dealt with at the plenum sounded even clearer, more striking and more emotional here at the V.I. Lenin SKK.

We cannot refrain from reproducing at least some of the slogans and placards which the representatives of many primary party organizations had brought with them to the square: "Politburo—render account at a special CPSU Central Committee plenum!" "Enough of repenting, let's get to work!" "We will not allow communism to be hit by way of perestroyka!" "No to anti-Leninism!" "Mikhail Sergeyevich, pay attention to the party!" "Central Committee members, what is your position?"...

Yes, such was the frame of mind of the meeting, which was opened by Boris Veniaminovich Gidaspov, first secretary of the Leningrad Obkom and Gorkom.

And truly the lines inscribed on the red canvases and striking and eye-catching slogans largely determined essentially the topics and nature of the speeches at the meeting. It was with good reason that many of the speakers who mounted the podium directly addressed from the platform the appeals on the placards. I.Yu. Nikodimov, deputy secretary of the "Krasnoye Znamya" Association party committee, for example, spoke with justified alarm about the weakening of the unity of the party ranks on account of the fact that the opinions of the primary party organizations were not being reflected in the political position of the CPSU Central Committee, particularly in the solution of vital ideological questions. Precision and decisiveness in anticipatory action by no means signify a "tightening of the screws," such measures are dictated by the development of perestroyka itself and the vital necessity for finally switching from words to actual deeds and strengthening discipline and order. Democracy is not permissiveness!

"How can we take the events developing in the country calmly," R.A. Saushev, director of the "Burevestnik"

Boarding School, said with emotion from the platform. "Yes, A.N. Yakovlev, member of the party Central Committee Politburo, calls on us to restrain our emotions. But the deepening crisis in the party cannot be viewed with sang-froid for so long."

And the speaker, turning to the slogan "Politburo—render account at a special Central Committee plenum!" called on those assembled to seek the convening of a special party congress which could make a high-minded and precise evaluation of the personal activity of each member of the Politburo in accordance with the CPSU rules. The participants in the meeting approved this appeal from the platform with applause.

The speakers emphasized with serious concern that in the 5th year of perestroyka a mood of disquiet and uncertainty in the future were growing in society instead of the anticipated stabilization. Interethnic conflicts engendering bloody dramas and the deaths of local inhabitants and young soldiers are unceasing. Among those who have fallen "not in war" have been students of the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] Higher Political School. S.V. Stepashin, a lecturer of this military VUZ [higher educational institution], who mounted the podium, spoke with sadness about the severe losses and called on those assembled to do everything to have the soldiers returned to their educational institutions. And to ensure that it never again be necessary to resort to the Armed Forces to solve national conflicts. There are methods and means for this—political, organizational, and social. It is high time they were commissioned.

The speakers raised many acute, urgent matters in their speeches. And practically all of them emphasized the idea of convening a special plenum or congress of the CPSU or bringing forward the opening of the 28th party congress. Yes, the opinions of the speakers differed in respect of the name of the future party forum and the date it should be held. But they were united in their demand that the elections of the delegates be direct and offer a choice, and be from the party okrugs and rayon and primary party organizations. The mechanism and system of intraparty democracy should be such that each communist perceive in practice that the adoption of party decisions and resolutions depend also on him personally and his vote.

It was these urgent topics which were, perhaps, the most striking in the speeches of the "apparatchik": A.I. Chaykovskiy, instructor of the Kirovskiy Gorkom; S.N. Petrov, assistant professor at the university; N.V. Sargin, mechanic of the "Elektronpribor" Association; V.V. Skomorokhov, secretary of a shop party organization of the Kronshtadt Marine Parts Plant; V.N. Sukhov, head of a department of the S.M. Kirov Forestry Engineering Academy; and V.A. Yefimov, secretary of the Leningrad Gorkom.

The speakers, who ardently urged a revival at all levels of party activity of truly Leninist principles of democratic centralism, called for an end to bureaucratic centralism in the party. Yu.G. Terentyev, secretary of the party committee of the M.V. Frunze "Arsenal" Association; V.V. Belyakov, secretary of the party bureau of the 16th shop of the "Izhorskiy zavod"; and N.G. Vlasov, chairman of the Krasnogvardeyskiy Rayon People's Court, asserted in their speeches from the platform that it is in the democratization of intraparty life and its very organization that both the essence and methods of renewal of the party and the consolidation of the authority of the communists among the working people are contained.

Perestroyka is intended by its whole content to serve to improve the life of the working people and the development of socialism. And vain are the hopes of those who intend "striking with perestroyka" at communism and socialist ideals and who are endeavoring to take profitable advantage of the crisis both for the realization of their personal ambitions and for the multiplication of unearned income, the speakers emphasized.

"We say an emphatic 'No!' to private property as a means of the legalization and enrichment of the smart operators of the shadow economy," M.A. Aleksandrov, senior lecturer at the Military Communications Academy, who was supported by those assembled and other speakers, declared at the meeting.

The participants in the meeting unanimously approved the action platform of the Leningrad party organization. Its essence was clearly and amply reflected in the appeal to Leningraders of the joint plenum of the obkom and gorkom, leaflets with the text of which were distributed by agitators in the square.

Leningrad's communists link the realization of the propositions of this platform, the renewal of the party, the democratization of intraparty life, and a strengthening of party discipline with their hopes and specific action pertaining to a restoration of the authority of the CPSU and the enhancement of its vanguard role in the revolutionary transformations of Soviet society. And it was surely no accident that one of those who spoke at the meeting, A.N. Lezin, head of the Department of Vocational-Technical Education Personnel Improvement, declared that having familiarized himself with the platform and the position of the Leningrad party organization, he felt himself a Bolshevik for the first time in many years.

...This meeting, like any other mass action, will certainly be evaluated variously. Neither shall we venture an unequivocal appraisal thereof right away. Time is needed also to take in all that was said at it and its consequences.

But one thing is certain—the sincerity of its participants. Thousands of the city's communists came to the square outside the V.I. Lenin SKK because they wish to remain silent no longer and because they have realized that remaining silent today is immoral. For rank and file party members, for the party organizations, and for the Central Committee.

Imbued with a call to act and take the cause of perestroyka and socialism into one's own hands was a resolution which was adopted unanimously at the meeting and which will be published.

Gidaspov Advocates 'Centralism'

90UN0407C Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 22 Nov 89 pp 1, 2, 3

[Report by B.V. Gidaspov, first secretary of the Leningrad Oblast Party Committee, at the joint plenum of the Leningrad Oblast and City CPSU Committees on 21 November: "For Socialist Ideals of Perestroyka"]

[Text] Dear Comrades!

It is time to check our reference points. It is time for us Communists to thoroughly come to grips with what is happening, as they say, in our own "party home." If we do not do this today, it will be a hundred times more difficult to do it tomorrow. People expect precise political assessments of the present and, particularly, of the future.

At any meeting we obkom [oblast party committee] and gorkom [city party committee] officials are asked one and the same questions: "What has perestroyka done for the ordinary working man? What might he expect? Are we not going backward or, as some people are already saying, forward toward capitalism? Who is responsible for the growing crisis?"

And, finally, what is the party today: a debating club or still a real political force? Is it capable of keeping society from rolling into the mire of chaos? These questions are as yet being put to us. If we, from the primary organization through the CPSU Central Committee, fail to find answers to them, and if they are not backed by specific action and a realistic program of the revival of the motherland, people will in the future be addressing them to other political forces.

Let us look truth in the eye. Society should be defined as being in a state of crisis. In the fifth year of perestroyka the situation in the economy has deteriorated sharply. Thus, in the region's industry, say, the increase in the manufacture of products in 10 months constituted less than 2% against a growth of the population's monetary income of more than 15%. The ruble is being devalued not only as the equivalent of certain material benefits, but also as an incentive in labor activity. Increasingly new commodities, including basic necessities, are falling into the scarce category. Deformations and irregularities in the cooperative movement are clearly visible.

All this has increased the socioeconomic differentiation of society. Primarily pensioners, invalids, and survivors of the blockade have found themselves hardest hit. In Leningrad alone there are over 250,000 persons actually living below the poverty line. The problems of the youth and the other least socially protected categories of the population have intensified.

Many of the levers of the control of society have been lost. Executive authority is at times simply impotent. The slogan "all is permitted which is not legally prohibited" is frequently being interpreted as permissiveness. As a result, even the new legal instruments are incapable of influencing people's line of behavior.

An example is the strike movement in the country, the consequences of which have not bypassed Leningrad either. Or another instance: In the current year alone, absenteeism at industrial enterprises here has been in excess of 160,000 man-days, which is almost 20% more than in the corresponding period of 1988.

Organized crime has become a reality. The number of serious offenses is showing a steady trend toward an increase. Social stratification and the orgy of crime are undoubtedly related processes. It is not hard to understand that the growth of wealth at one pole of society not only ricochets against the other, but also evokes in people a feeling of distrust, embitterment, and aggression.

The obvious deterioration in the socioeconomic climate and the incapacity or reluctance to find and implement the appropriate measures to stabilize it could, as is being observed in other regions, bring masses of people out onto the streets. And there arise the questions: Whom will they follow? Which leaders and which programs will be supported in the process of the impending elections?

Can the most acute problems now be tackled without the CPSU, without a stimulation of the ideological and organizational potential of the party? No, I am profoundly convinced, they cannot!

It is time to forgo the reassuring references to the fact that the CPSU, abiding by the command of the times, advanced the idea of perestroyka. This was indeed the case. But nearly 5 years have elapsed since then.

In reality, having given a powerful boost to the revolutionary transformations and having formulated the general directions of their development, the party got stuck in the starting gate, as they say. And while having raised people from the trenches of stagnation, it failed to arm them properly and was thereby unable to be the headquarters it should have been.

The main weapon of the Bolsheviks had always been precision of program guidelines and an ability to show people clear prospects. It was on this basis that the ideological conviction and authority of the party and its leading role, not declarative but actual, were shaped. It is precisely all this that we are lacking today.

In addition, some Communists (including those in the top echelon of the party leadership) are observing with cool detachment how the process of the concentrated purposive erosion of socialist ideals is progressing and how we are being engulfed by a one-sided interpretation of the undoubtedly complex and dramatic, but also heroic history of our motherland.

All this is making its mark. Visiting enterprises, schools, and VUZ's [higher educational institutions], I frequently hear the pained question: Where is the foundation on which our children's souls will be formed? Can nihilism, egotism, and aspirituality cultivated against a background of the unchecked defamation of the party and our entire past engender creative principles?

These questions are being drowned out, however, in the chorus of voices calling on us to repent, repent, repent, hang our heads ever lower, and look away in shame.

I believe that remaining silent, glossing over, and playing the hypocrite in this connection is now immoral, to say the least.

There is a limit to everything. We say: "Communists, let us lift up our heads. Let us close our ranks in the name of socialism!"

We are breaking emphatically with the ideology of Stalinism and stagnation. But we are convinced that our banner was and will remain red. And inscribed thereon: Lenin, October, socialism.

We will cease to be ourselves if we forgo our socialist values and permit frenzied pseudo-democrats to fool people with honeyed tales about "people's capitalism," unlimited democracy, and nonparty glasnost.

It is no secret to anyone that the extent of the turnover of the shadow economy in the USSR is put at hundreds of billions of rubles and that, according to some figures, 5% of savings bank depositors own 80% of total deposits. Under these conditions it is not hard to understand who really would be the master of the factories and plants, newspapers, and banks in the event of a denationalization of the economy and legalization of private property. It is from this camp that the cry "Stop, thief!" is being heard loudest of all today. They do not have to hire town criers for their "ideas". Having filled the television screens and newspaper pages, they are grieving over the fact that an offensive against democracy and glasnost is underway.

But I call to mind the words of Comrade Arefin spoken at a past joint plenum: "Why is it that recently leaders of various fronts have felt at home on television, whereas I—a worker, hero of socialist labor, and member of the gorkom—have not been appeared on it once?"

Let us be particular. Today the play is all at one perfectly definite end of the field in certain publications of the press. The pseudo-democratic nightstick threatens all who venture to express dissident thoughts, and ideas concerning the incurability of our society are being spurred on.

What should the response to this be? We do not know of a doctor who gets a patient back on his feet by telling him over and over again about his ailments. Instead of wallowing in our social ailments, it is surely time for everyone to engage together in a search for constructive ways to overcome them.

There is no alternative to perestroyka. We state this firmly, clearly, and unequivocally. It is entirely a matter of who would like to change it and in what direction.

There is no need after what has been said, I believe, to especially explain why the draft action program of the Leningrad CPSU organization has appeared. Time does not wait.

The collective reason of the party, real dialogue with the people—these are not just words. They are the fulcrum of support with which we can and are obliged to change the crisis situation.

Born of consultation with the Communists and all inhabitants of Leningrad, the appreciably renewed action program of the Leningrad party organization is in your hands. As distinct from the first draft, it is of a more precise nature. Ideological and political reference points are designated quite clearly therein.

Summarizing the opinion of the majority of Leningrad's Communists, it answers questions concerning the social and class base of the CPSU and offers an ideological basis for unity with possible political allies.

At the same time, it proposes a mechanism of the party's democratic self-cleansing of indifferent holders of membership cards. And, what is very important, it lays the foundation for the conversion of the CPSU into a truly democratic political organization professing the principles: "Unity of Aims—Freedom of Action" and "With Us Are Those Who Are for Socialism".

We understand that our program sets a certain limit on political compromise. This is a recognized step. It is well known that balancing between plus and minus ad infinitum is impossible. The result in this case does not go beyond the zero reading. In other words, in this situation it would be a question of the party's future being deadlocked in the power structure.

This idea should not be understood to mean that the CPSU should dart to the right or left. The party must have its own clear-cut line, not borrowing it from extreme movements.

And today there are many extremes, and at times even outwardly attractive one, what is more.

Behind them—and this needs to be clearly seen—there are real forces with perfectly particular political ambitions and aims.

The result can be seen: a public frame of mind which is to a considerable extent disoriented. People's consciousness has been befuddled by images of ubiquitous bureaucrats, apparatchiks, chauvinists, Stalinists, anti-Semites, and other terrifying chimeras. It is clear that manipulating people is easier against the background of this dispiriting kaleidoscope. And this is being done. And frequently not unsuccessfully.

Meanwhile, efforts continue to be made from high platforms to persuade us that we are all rowing in the same boat. But to develop this image further, it could be particularized as follows: "Yes, we are rowing all right, but in different directions, the result being that we are going around in a circle." A clear course, a knowledge of the reefs and shoals, and a harnessing of efforts in one direction are essential.

Comrades! In the course of the discussion the vast majority of party members demanded that the obkom and gorkom make a political evaluation of the various movements and associations, define their attitude toward the prospects of cooperation with them, and denote the fundamental differences.

Let us begin with the most active organization, in outward manifestations, in any event—the Leningrad People's Front [LPF]. If we analyze the LPF's program documents closely, it is not hard to discover many similarities with the party program of perestroyka. It is this fact, I believe, which is attracting to the ranks of the front many people who are sincerely concerned at the slow pace, inconsistency, and half-baked nature of the measures pertaining to the practical embodiment of the ideas of the renewal of socialism.

But something else should be seen also. For some of the leaders of the LPF their so-called official declarations are no more than a screen behind which they are attempting to conceal their true colors and true aims: the dismantling of socialism and the capitalization of society. It is not fortuitous that the most extreme movements like the Democratic Union, anarcho- syndicalists, monarchists, and the like are linking up with them so easily and readily.

Today, on the threshold of the elections, the radical left, as it sometimes calls itself even, is conducting a concentrated offensive against the electorate, hoping to break through to power in this way.

The leaders of the radicals are parading their own efforts pertaining to the creation of strike committees at the enterprises. At the same time, the so-called "democratic community" is intimidating the population with the idea of a future destabilization of the situation, the imposition of dictatorship and martial law, and other political cataclysms which the apparatus or partocracy, to use their vocabulary, is allegedly contemplating.

I say with all certainty that this is a shameless provocation. There is no one today more interested in political stability in the region than the Leningrad party organization. We need time and calm in order to implement the reforms, lift the economy, and resolve social problems.

It is a question of something else. Are there today forces which need destabilization? Whom would this benefit? Historical anomalies and the experience of political struggle say clearly about this that a deterioration in the situation, a weakening of power and chaos are profitable to the forces endeavoring in all ways to make financial and political capital for themselves. To dispel all doubts it is sufficient to reproduce the slogans raised under banners of various colors in the column of "democratic forces" on 7 December: "Down With Soviet Monopolism!" "Party, Give Us a Turn at the Wheel!" "Down With the Partocracy" and, finally, quite frankly: "Let Us Use Perestroyka To Strike at Communism!" No comment needed, I believe.

Somewhat apart in the ranks of the public formations stands the United Workers Front [OFT]. It is perfectly obvious that the midwife of the OFT was in fact the People's Front, just as in the Baltic area the interfronts emerged as a counterweight to the people's fronts. In politics, as in physics, there is no one pole without the other.

The social base of the OFT is on the one hand the workers, on the other, that part of the intelligentsia which categorically rejects the basic ideas of the LPF. They rightly believe that the country's preceding history is characterized by an appreciable deviation from the principles of scientific communism. At the same time, however, while evaluating negatively the focus and course of perestroyka, the leaders of the OFT are urging the unambiguous priority of the working class in political life.

What is more, an orientation toward strict methods of leadership and a return to the dictatorship of the proletariat is being manifested increasingly clearly among these forces. They see the way out of the crisis on the path of political stability at the expense of a limitation of democracy.

We can see that the strength of the OFT lies in its patriotic position, in its aspiration to order and stability and, what is most important, in the struggle for the protection of the working man—the creator of material values—today and in the future. This movement's weakness lies in its irreconcilable confrontation with its opponents, certain outdated slogans of the times of war communism, and a certain predisposition toward dogmatism and quotation-mongering.

The OFT also has begun the election struggle. It is championing the need for elections by production okrugs. This is its right. The reasoning behind production okrugs is not unattractive, particularly to the large collectives. This idea should evidently not be either unreservedly accepted or rejected out of hand.

The point being that with the introduction of territorial cost accounting and self-financing the enterprises will become the main economic base of the soviets in the solution of social questions. And the work force will have the right to pose the question of direct control of the use of the resources they earn. And who should exercise this control if not their representatives in the soviet?

I can say with certainty just one thing: If the idea of production okrugs is supported somewhere or other, this

should not be and will not be some circuituous path into the soviets for party officials. I am profoundly convinced that party officials must win support and trust among the population, running for office only through the territorial okrugs. Our main aim is to arrive at the elections in unity with all those who are really concerned about the fate of the city of Lenin and Leningrad Oblast, and about improving Leningraders' life.

We call on all public organizations, veterans and women, Miloserdiye [Charity] and Memorial, the Red Cross and the Children's Fund, the Culture Fund, the artistic unions, the trade unions, and the Komsomol [Leninist Communist Youth League], our deeply respected inhabitants of blockaded Leningrad, and S&T and other societies to actively nominate their candidates and render them the utmost assistance in the election struggle.

In speaking of relations with the informal associations, we refer to partner interaction not with these organizations as a whole. This would be possible only in the event of our accepting their programs in full. And this is not the case. But we see in these programs many goals whose realization would be of benefit to the majority of Leningraders. We are prepared to cooperate in the accomplishment of these common tasks.

It is a question of the development of the people's genuine self-management, the revival of the city's cultural life, realization of a program of territorial cost accounting, the solution of ecological problems, and concern for veterans, survivors of the blockade, and the younger generation. And whoever spurns the hand we are offering, let him not say that the main thing for him is the interests of the people.

We have for the first time in many years, perhaps, found ourselves in the position of a political party struggling to influence the masses.

The rapidly growing new forms of people's public self-assertiveness—various fronts and movements—have somehow turned to themselves the attention of the party committees. We have unforgivably relegated to the background here such a very important area of work as the influence of the party committees in the work force via interaction with the trade unions. If it sees the party as the spokesman for its political interests, we will in this case really find therein support in the struggle for the socialist ideals of perestroyka.

In recent months the Soviet trade unions have been drawing serious conclusions in a rethinking of their role and have formulated new strategy and tactics for their actions. Their main proposition is a firm socialist orientation, proclamation of independence of action, a dispensing with the numerous functions in the sphere of the organization of production which are not their province, and an orientation toward defense of the labor and social rights of the working people.

A whole package of demands connected with the stabilization of the working people's economic situation was addressed in the course of the Sixth AUCCTU Plenum in September and, subsequently, of the plenum of the Leningrad Oblast Council of Trade Unions to the government and the local soviets. Of course, this new position of the unions may or may not be to the liking of some people. But this is an objective reality and needs to be reckoned with.

Proceeding from these realities, we will have to restructure the relations of the party and trade union authorities, which should run via a recognition of their new role in society.

It is necessary primarily in the present political situation, in order to influence the unions, to abandon the former cliches of "leadership" and recognize them as an active partner in public life. The party committees are obliged to respect the organizational independence of the unions and their right to independently decide all questions of their internal life without exception.

We have no way of pursuing the party line other than via the Communists working in the elective union bodies. This is logical and natural.

The main thing is to ensure that as many Communists as possible with the necessary knowledge and authority and taking the cause of the collective to heart emerge in the course of the report and election campaign in the leading trade union bodies. It is necessary to win the trust and support of the rank and file union members in open, honest struggle.

The ispolkoms [executive committees] of the oblast and city soviets of people's deputies have yet to find themselves completely in today's complex atmosphere. The good and sound decisions adopted in a number of cases are not being followed by specific action. The organizational structure of administration is not being perfected quickly enough. The multilevel nature of the system and the duplication in work frequently lead to the trifling tutelage of the enterprises and organizations. Their creative initiative is thereby fettered. Supervision of execution is lacking. The decisions adopted and the measures mapped out frequently remained just a declaration and are not fulfilled. A very great deal of work must still be done in this field, via personnel policy, primarily.

The question of the actual incorporation in constructive work on the renewal of our society of Leningrad's Komsomol members and all young men and women is acute. It is customary to say that the youth are our future. Our approach is such: Young people today are an active driving force of perestroyka. The party and Komsomol organizations must create the conditions for their full-blooded participation in all social processes.

Unfinished business, problems in labor and moral education, and serious ideological costs have been the reason why some of our young people have been squandering their unclaimed energy in demonstrations that are

far from being to the benefit of society. A search for new, non-cliche forms of the education of young men and women presupposing the equal dialogue of the different generations is essential.

We support the youth's aspiration to independence, without which the formation of the true citizen, patriot, and internationalist is impossible. We support the initiatives of the student body geared to a radical increase in the quality of the training of specialists corresponding to the demands of the times. The party committees are interested in the maximally efficient organization of the teaching and educational process in the higher and secondary specialized educational institutions.

At all times the measure of a man's value has been labor. This category is slipping from the field of vision of the Komsomol organizations and has, as a whole, been relegated to the background in the system of education of the younger generation. The renewal of socialism means primarily labor, a great deal of creative work, which cannot be accomplished without the youth.

Our slogan is "A Way Out of the Crisis on the Paths of Political Stability and Democracy!" But this is only a tactical goal. We would not be a serious political force unless we clearly formulated our strategic guidelines, for we understand that only ideology is the platform for long-term consolidation. It is for this reason, taking the Communists' opinion as the basis, that we have attempted in the new version of the action program offered you to formulate the basic reference points toward which the Leningrad party organization is moving along the path of perestroyka.

Present-day socialism, in our understanding, should be characterized by:

—the dialectical combination of general and class interests, given the priority of interests common to all mankind;

—an efficient and dynamic economy, the basis of which is public ownership with a diversity of forms of its realization and the use of other types of ownership not based on the exploitation of wage labor;

—the organic combination of planned principles of management with developed commodity-money relationships;

—ecological culture and the harmonization of the relations of society and nature;

—social justice, where the working man is ensured the maximum protection, given consistent implementation of the principle of distribution according to labor, and the eradication of all forms of wage-leveling and economic parasitism;

—an irreconcilable struggle against all criminal manifestations in our society, consistent defense of human rights, and unswerving observance of Soviet legislation;

—relations of genuine equality, fraternity, and friendship between peoples and the dialectical combination therein of the principles of socialist patriotism, national pride, and internationalism;

—the democratic organization of the political power of the working people based on legality and self-management;

—genuine humanism, the all-around and harmonious development of the individual, and the free development of each as a condition of the free development of all;

—high culture and morals inheriting and multiplying the best achievements of mankind's spiritual development; and

—a love of peace and respect for the social choice of other peoples.

The sources of the CPSU's ideology are rooted in creative Marxism-Leninism constituting the foundation of the contemporary concept of socialism. The ideological unity of the Communists should be formed on this basis.

A principal cause of the crisis phenomena in our society is the fact that the correct propositions of scientific communism were perceived dogmatically, and the methodology of scientific communism was made an object of veneration, and not study.

Vladimir Ilich Lenin wrote in his article "Our Program": "We by no means view Marx's theory as something consummate and inviolable; we are convinced, on the contrary, that it has only laid the cornerstone of the science which socialists must advance in all directions if they do not wish to lag behind life."

A reality of the social and political situation in the period of perestroyka has been the multiplicity of opinions. While supporting the expansion thereof, recognizing the right of each to freedom of belief and rejecting the administrative suppression of dissidence, the Communists must oppose the propaganda of war and violence, exploitation and social inequality, nationalism and chauvinism, atheistic and religious intolerance, and other inhumane views.

We do not lay claim to a monopoly in the formulation of the political course of the development of society, but we do aspire to the fullest possible depiction in our program documents of the interests of the vast majority. And in this connection it is necessary to clearly determine the social base of the CPSU.

While speaking of the Communist Party as a political organization, we recognize that it was born as the party of the working class. Its purpose has always been the unification of all working people around socialist ideals. While maintaining continuity of the aims of the workers movement, it has in the process of the development of Soviet society become a party of all the working people.

Today the party is endeavoring to express and uphold the fundamental interests of this basic part of the Soviet people and unite all progressive forces of society that stand on a socialist foundation.

As I have already said, the basis of consolidation of the party is ideological unity. But it is nothing without organizational unity. New wine cannot be poured into old bottles here. The Stalinist understanding of the organizational unity of the party is a minefield beneath not only the party itself, but also society as a whole.

In the process of renewal of the party, a most important task is the removal of deformations in the organizational structure of the CPSU connected with a distortion of the principle of democratic centralism. At a particular stage of history it was, as is known, replaced by bureaucratic centralism, and the primary party organizations and rank and file Communists lost the practical possibility of influencing the content of party activity.

Discussing the draft action program, many Leningrad Communists supported the need for a revival of the Leninist understanding of the principles of democratic centralism and the guarantee in practice of full freedom of discussion prior to the adoption of decisions and unity of action upon their realization.

What does this mean for us? We advocate the Central Committee adopting a decision on the main, fundamental issues and clearly defining common goals, but the ways, forms, and means of their achievement must be sought locally, proceeding from the specific conditions.

Accordingly, the obkom and gorkom must operate in this way with regard to the lower party organizations. This approach will make it possible to increase in practice the independence of all components of the party in realization of the adopted decisions.

But greater independence of action presupposes the proportional, rather, a greater growth of responsibility. How to link in a single chain the concepts "independence," "responsibility," and "efficiency" of party work? We must give our unequivocal answer to this question: via conviction and party discipline. No one has yet found any other way.

I know that I am expressing a far from popular thought. However, the situation taking shape in our society is making it incumbent upon us to call everything by its name.

I am categorically opposed to the label of supporter of the "strong hand" which people are attempting persistently to pin on me. But meetings in the labor collectives, the mail addressed to me, and readers' letters in the papers and on television unambiguously testify that people are tired of sloppiness and irresponsibility.

The decline in discipline in our party work also is becoming apparent. Overcoming all this with persuasion and exhortation is impossible. For this reason I am sure that at the present stage of our country's development centralism is simply essential. It should be based on the mutual responsibility of the higher and lower authorities.

If the decision of a higher party committee is not fulfilled owing to the fact that it was initially insufficiently thought out and projected, party responsibility should be borne by the elective body, up to and including the CPSU Central Committee.

The Communists must know who specifically bore what kind of party responsibility for the elaboration of nonviable decisions. If, however, the blame for the nonfulfillment of decrees lies with the lower authority, it, in all stringency, bears the responsibility.

The entire process of preparation, formulation, and adoption of a decision and the course of its realization must be public and monitored by the party organizations and the Communists, including discussion of the reports of members of the obkom and gorkom and, particularly, full-time party officials to the Communists and the work force.

For the problem in question they must prepare, on the basis of study and consideration of public opinion, alternative proposals and drafts. All members of the elective authorities and people working in the party apparatus are obliged to participate in constructive political dialogue with the party organizations, specialists, and the public.

It is essential that the decision clearly reflect what must be done by the executive bodies (bureau, secretariat), each member of the party committee, and the apparatus. Then it will be possible both to hold everyone to account and to monitor at any given moment the progress of realization of the resolution. Hitherto, however, we have been removing them from supervision "as fulfilled in the main," but in practice there has been absolutely no change with regard to specific positions.

In the process of discussion of the draft certain Communists literally fulminated against the party's cadre policy, considering it the backbone of the command and administrative system. And what is more, the critics often reached the point of complete absurdity, rejecting systems, structures, and a machinery of administration altogether. As if there could be totally unadministered states. Not only a naive but also a dangerous delusion.

I categorically disagree also with those who connect destruction of the command and administrative system with the party's renunciation of purposive and consistent cadre work.

Policy is implemented via people: This is a fundamental Leninist proposition. No political structure is capable of realizing its ends via a mechanism of power without a personnel policy. And if it is not assumed by the soviets of people's deputies and the Communist Party, this will unfailingly be done by some other forces. In other interests, of course.

Consequently, it should be a question not of a withdrawal of the personnel levers from the party's political arsenal, but of bringing it fully into line with the policy of perestroyka and the renewal of society.

It would seem that we should be taking cardinal steps in the area of the decentralization of cadre work by way of the delegation of a considerable amount of authority in decisions on personnel issues from the top downward—from the higher to the lower party committees—and making them equal subjects of personnel policy.

Criticism of the obkom and gorkom has been heard frequently, particularly in recent times, for insufficient consideration of the opinions of the primary party organizations in decisions on cadre questions.

We accept it. But let us together create a system precluding the lack of choice. Believe me, it is very often engendered not by the "intrigues" of the apparatus, but by existing realities: the extremely limited nature of the available options.

We are just a matter of months away from the report and election campaign and the party conference, which will once again confront us squarely with cadre problems. We need to be preparing for this even now, immediately.

Each party committee and party bureau should be determining the list of offices for which it will select candidates, informally evaluating their professional, political, and human capabilities. We should not just recall these cadres when the time for election to this office or the other comes around. We need to work with them constantly, prepare public opinion in support of them, and afford them wide-ranging opportunities for testing themselves in practice.

Such an approach should become the rule in the cadre policy of the raykoms [rayon party committees] and gorkoms and the obkom.

Comrades! The party's ideological and organizational renewal must necessarily be accompanied by qualitative changes in its ranks. Earlier it was customary in party leaders' reports to substantiate the strength of the party by references to the fact that the army of Communists was 19 million strong. But it was precisely the point that this fact was not that manifest an indication of strength in a country with more than 280 million inhabitants.

I agree fully with the Communists who believe that the party's leading role cannot be declared by articles of the Constitution. It is now a question of it either being practicable or not. It is known that our Basic Law contained no such entry prior to 1977. But we had the years of the Stalinist times and voluntarism and arbitrary action. It then appeared, not having prevented the development and intensification of the stagnation period. So it is not a matter of declarations.

But such a fundamental document as the USSR Constitution cannot be turned upside down, bit-by-bit. This is the law by which our society currently lives. After all, it contains together with Article "six," Article "two," also clearly defining to whom power belongs.

For this reason, it is important today to complete proposals for the Constitutional Commission on how in the Basic Law to correctly reflect the role of a political party in society. This question should be taken into consideration at the time of examination of the new CPSU rules also.

Many Communists are proposing a purge of the party. We can understand them. The title of member of the CPSU has been devalued to a considerable extent. It has even reached the point of certain holders of party cards declaring that they pursue in the CPSU the line of this latter-day politicized organization or the other.

What can we say here?

We are opposed to a purge; this is a forcible mechanism. We are for the Communists' self-determination, not in the sense of freedom from program and statutory requirements. This would be disastrous for the party as a political organism. Self-determination should mean the right to freely leave the CPSU without any consequences for a person's social character, so to speak.

Each person is obliged, finally, to determine whose side he is on.

I appeal to the primary party organizations: Friends, help those who are wavering to make a choice and, if necessary, use the rights afforded us by the CPSU rules. Enough of undermining the party from within. It is necessary to be honest with oneself and with people. If you are a Communist, this should be perceived daily by everyone in all things!

Party enrollment is declining currently. In the 10 months our ranks were reinforced by 2,800 people, compared to 6,400 in the same period of last year. But I believe that those admitted will be conscious fighters and real party members. Some 3,700 people handed in their party cards in this same period in the Leningrad city party organization. What is this—flight or the shedding of ballast?

The second, most likely, on the whole.

It is the programmed seekers after political benefits who are leaving primarily, of course. The last election campaign showed what dividends demonstrative departures from the party can bring among a certain part of the population.

Those who were recruited per a multiple purchase order, an understanding of the quality of the ranks being rectilinearly connected merely with social origins, are handing in their party cards also. They are those who, as a rule, joined the party not out of conviction, and who for this reason are also leaving it with indifference.

But there is also a third category. It is these whom we do not want to lose. These are people who feel keenly for the party, take its blunders to heart, and cannot understand

its present inconsistency of action. And these people constitute almost 20%. Consequently, they are not finding support in their primary organizations and are not, consequently, hearing precise and clear answers to their questions. We are obliged to and will struggle for them.

Comrades!

As the discussion of our draft program showed, a most important question troubling party cadres today is the formulation and assimilation of new forms and methods of the party organizations' political influence on the economy.

The food and housing problems, the situation concerning goods and services, and the ecological situation have today entered the sphere of most acute political tasks, in whose speediest accomplishment Leningraders are vitally interested.

It was these questions, as a rule, which figured sharply on the agenda during discussion of the draft program.

What did frank discussion of the draft show?

The prevailing opinion in the activity of the work force and its leaders was that the main thing in economic reform and in the transition to economic methods of management was the lifting of all restrictions from the growth of income. Practically all industrial enterprises, research and planning-design organizations, and, of course, the cooperatives are in practice availing themselves of this.

Group egotism is essentially corroding the economy. Frequently feeling himself to be a time-server, an elected director is forced to take the line of least resistance. There is no getting him back onto a state track by any party-political measures.

Can it be considered normal when the bulk of the profits of light industry enterprises is formed thanks to an increase in the manufacture of products with the "N" [new] and "Dts" [contract price] markers, which by no means always guarantees an improvement in their quality.

Thus, over half the profits of the knitwear enterprises, and 30% for the majority of garment associations are obtained thanks to this factor. This is leading to the withdrawal from manufacture of inexpensive commodities which are in demand, but which are unprofitable to the manufacturers. Such examples may be found in other sectors.

The imperfection and, at times, contradiction of the new economic mechanism is leading at the level of the basic component—enterprises and organizations—to the plans determined for them being fulfilled and overfulfilled. At the same time, however, the overall state of the economy is not improving. In other words, processes are occurring in the economy which are manifestly contrary to both economic laws and elementary common sense.

Is there a way out of this impasse? We see its formula today as follows: regional self-management, the structural reorganization of the economy, the demonopolization of regional production, financial autonomy, and production and engineering discipline.

The majority of Leningraders supported the proposal concerning a transition to regional financial autonomy and self-management and link therewith hopes for the priority solution of the most acute social problems which have built up and the rational use of and an increase in the scientific, intellectual, and cultural potential of Leningrad and the oblast—our main property and wealth.

At the same time, we must recognize that a change in the system of administration and management in the region will not produce instantaneous results. In addition, until the processes of self-regulation of the system begin, the slump in economic and social development will continue.

Consequently, what is required is not only thorough work, but much patience also. Leningrad should set an example in the approach to the restructuring of the system of territorial administration based on a balanced combination of the interests of the region and those of the whole country.

Further, the structure of industry. This is a question not even of today but of yesterday. The reprofiling of works which are unnecessary and sometimes dangerous to the city, operation in a united front against the diktat of the departments—these are our tasks. It is not the departments but we Leningraders who should determine our economic and social interests: what we should build and what we should modernize, and what we should close down or have taken outside of the region.

Otherwise, what will happen?

We have for a long time been wringing our hands over the excessive strain on the social sphere, speaking simultaneously about a shortage of labor resources. More than 30,000 persons have been brought into the city in the current 5-year plan, on a yearly average, into such industries as the yarn and thread industries, weaving and knitwear included.

Imports of raw materials, intermediate products and, what is particularly serious, people are required, in turn. And this means newer and newer problems of their attendant development: provision with accommodation and public catering, and the allocation of additional places in kindergartens, schools, hospitals, and clinics.

The problems are snowballing. Essentially all components of the social sphere are pulled into the rotation. While in other regions and republics there is a raw material base for these industries and a manpower surplus also. These questions require a state approach and a state solution at the level of the USSR Supreme Soviet and our deputy corps therein.

The next item in our formula is struggle against monopolism in the regional economy, the overcoming of giantmania, and the conversion of the working people into the masters of production. Moving toward the extensive introduction in the region of the idea of state enterprises with flexible structures and various joint-stock forms would seem expedient in this sense.

A more selective system of management and the organization of production is a command of the times. The income of the state and the region may take shape here not only thanks to tax revenues, but also from dividends and income on their package of shares. We could set the task of the transfer to these forms primarily of unprofitable enterprises in 1990-1991.

Current economic strategy should be geared to the full subordination of the entire economy to the social sphere, and we need to proceed from the priority of social programs. This applies both to financially autonomous market relations and the planning and management of the economy.

We need to consider the main criterion in the social sphere itself an improvement in people's way of life and deliverance from the threat of ecological catastrophe.

Among the priority urgent tasks, the food question is of particular political resonance. People need to be fed first of all. And it is becoming more and more difficult to do this. The republics and the regions—the suppliers of food under the conditions of financial autonomy—are endeavoring primarily to satisfy their own requirements. Consequently, this concern also will increasingly be a matter for us also.

An analysis of the actual situation shows that it is necessary to continue to build up the potential of agriculture at a rapid pace for the accomplishment of a cardinal breakthrough in an increase in the production of food products and raw material. This means the accomplishment of a dual task: an increase in the efficiency of the farming and animal husbandry sectors thanks to the extensive use of the achievements of S&T progress, and the fuller realization of available opportunities in the agro-industrial complex.

The resources invested in an increase in the production potential of our agricultural enterprises are immense. But the returns being obtained therefrom are far from adequate. There arises in this connection the question as to whether they have always been used correctly. I believe not. We have a master plan for the development of Leningrad and the oblast, a document which is well enough conceived and developed. We need to be guided by it more consistently.

More attention needs to be paid to an improvement in the social infrastructure of rural localities: the erection of accommodation and homestead-type homes with outhouses and other farm buildings, the development of the road system, and an improvement in material-technical facilities of health care and culture.

We will view the formation of new production relations in the countryside in a single complex with the extensive use of Leningrad's powerful S&T and intellectual potential. The problem will not be solved without this direct connection.

Only by having furnished production with modern equipment and having created a dependable base for the storage and processing of agricultural produce directly where it is cultivated will we be able finally to considerably reduce in practice the diversion of skilled productive forces of the city into agricultural operations associated with the use of manual labor.

Such work is proceeding, but the times demand a manifold increase in the efforts of the city's industrial enterprises engaged in the accomplishment of this task. Party committees and enterprise managers are obliged to view this as a particularly important party assignment.

A further increase in the efficiency of agriculture lies on the paths of the diversity of various organizational forms. An important place here belongs to the development of intrafarm leasing on the sovkhozes [state farms] and also individual and tenant farms and cooperative lessees.

Over 380 collectives are operating currently on the oblast's sovkhozes on lease or family contract terms, but the real work in this area is only just beginning.

And a few words further about our intraparty affairs. An analysis shows that as the shortcomings in a number of most important areas of economic activity are growing, the exactingness and scrupulousness of the party organizations in the evaluation of cadres for the assigned work are diminishing. The fact that in the current year there has been a more than three-fold reduction compared with 1986 in the number of Communist executives against whom party proceedings have been instituted testifies to a totally unwarranted liberalism on the part of the primary party organizations and the party committees.

There has been a diminution in the number of questions examined in the gorkoms and raykoms [rayon party committees] as a whole. Sight is being lost of the problems of socioeconomic development of the rayons and the work force and the most serious situation involving the production of consumer goods at the enterprises. The rendering of accounts by Communist executives has become extraordinarily infrequent.

A clause in the resolution of a joint plenum of the obkom and the Leningrad Gorkom on accounts from Communist executives on the solution of socioeconomic problems in the work force has been unfulfilled in the majority of gorkoms and raykoms.

There is a similar situation in enterprise and organization party committees and bureaus.

There is a multitude of examples on this score. It may be concluded from them that under the conditions of the

growth of the independence of the gorkoms and raykoms and enterprise and organization party committees and bureaus that they, as organs of collective leadership, are lacking responsibility and, perhaps, the skills of political work.

I should dwell particularly on the question of a further improvement in the activity of the Leningrad Obkom and Gorkom reflected in the draft of our program.

The reorganization of the machinery of the obkom and the Leningrad Gorkom conducted at the end of last year performed a particularly positive role in the restructuring of our work. However, the Communists are advocating further structural transformations of the party authorities and the removal of the current parallelism and duplication in the work of the obkom and the Leningrad Gorkom.

It is rightly mentioned that the current multilevel raykom-gorkom-obkom system fetters initiative, leads to the substitution of some bodies by others, and ultimately reduces the efficiency of party leadership. This problem was reflected in the draft of our program.

In examining the possible versions of the structural transformations, it is essential to proceed from the fact that Leningrad and the oblast are a single economic complex. It is imbued with a multitude of relationships primarily in socioeconomic life. Practically every enterprise of the oblast closely interacts with Leningrad associations and plants, and many are a part of them. Common fuel and power facilities and a common system have been created. The city consumes practically the entire agricultural product of the oblast and also decides questions of social development via the construction and operation of facilities in the oblast.

Proceeding from this, the vast majority of comrades considers unacceptable the realization of the proposal pertaining to division of the oblast party organization in two with a direct outlet to the CPSU Central Committee, which would lead merely to the disruption of the ties which have evolved, particularly under the conditions of the impending transition to regional cost accounting. However, the deprivation of Leningrad and its large party organization, with its tremendous historical experience and traditions, of its elective collegial body is not justified either.

In this connection, many Communists are proposing combination of the offices of obkom and gorkom first secretaries. This position has been supported, in the main, by the obkom and gorkom commissions.

It is contemplated to introduce in work practice here uniform forward and current planning and to ensure unity of action in the rendering of assistance to the rayon and primary party organizations—in a word, to thoroughly revise the structure of the machinery and remove all parallelism and duplication and the scattering of forces. Let us think about it together. It is up to the plenum to have its say.

Recently some party organizations (the Vasileostrovskiy Raykom plenum, Leninskiy Raykom Bureau) have been advocating the need for a special CPSU congress for an evaluation of the political situation in the country and the state of affairs in the party, the formulation of an action program, changes to the rules, and the election of a new CPSU Central Committee. It is proposed to hold this congress prior to the elections of people's deputies of the RSFSR and the local soviets.

What should we mention in this connection. First, such a block of problems cannot be prepared in high-quality manner for constructive discussion in a short space of time. Second, all structural components of the party will be forced to switch to the solution of these problems, which is unacceptable since it is necessary right now to perform in full measure in conjunction with the Soviet authorities and public organizations preparatory work for the impending difficult election campaign.

It would be more correct for the CPSU in this situation to conduct a serious conversation on intraparty problems and a discussion of the party's election platform at an enlarged CPSU Central Committee plenum.

Comrades! Concluding my speech, I would like to emphasize that perestroyka is not a one-time act but a lengthy process. While having expressed ourselves quite definitely on a number of most important questions of political life, we are far from thinking to have put an end to the matter here. We need to constantly and collectively consult the Communists and all who share our approaches to the renewal of socialism. It is this that we firmly intend to do henceforward.

Plenum Issues Appeal

90UN0407F Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 23 Nov 89 p 1

[Appeal of the joint plenum of the Leningrad Oblast Party Committee [Obkom] and City Party Committee [Gorkom]]

[Text] Dear Leningraders!

Our country is in a state of seriously aggravated crisis. Instead of the anticipated improvement in society, the mood of uncertainty and disquiet is growing. The situation in the economy is becoming more complex, inflation is increasing, and the role of organizational structures is being sweepingly rejected, which is leading to a growth of mismanagement and crime, anarchy, and social upheavals.

Can our children's souls be formed by a canceled past and unclear future, egotism and growing confrontation, and the worship of money and aspirituality?

It is time to concentrate on what is most important and to answer the question: How should socialism appear?

The deterioration in the situation and the disorganization are beneficial to the forces which are thirsting for

power. They are intimidating people with negative images of managers and of apparatchiks, nationalists, chauvinists, and Stalinists, and are engaging in outright provocation.

The dubious values of "people's" capitalism are being foisted on the country.

In the event of a resurrection of private ownership it will not be the work force but the smart operators of the shadow economy who will become the masters of the factories and plants and newspapers and banks.

But there is a limit to everything!

Communists and nonparty people! In the name of our glorious city, in the name of the renewal of socialism let us close our ranks! History will not forgive us for complacency and inactivity. Yes, we have broken decisively with the ideology of Stalinism and stagnation and the lawlessness and arbitrary action connected therewith. But our banner was and remains Red and on it will be inscribed: Lenin, October, Socialism!

Life confirms that there is no one more concerned for political stability in the region, the speediest solution of economic and social problems, and the democratization of intraparty life than Leningrad's communists. But time, calm and your support are needed for their solution.

It is essential to channel all efforts into the consolidation of society in the name of the creation and achievement of social justice, where the working man is ensured the maximum social protection given the consistent implementation of the principle of distribution according to labor and the eradication of all forms of both wage-leveling and social parasitism.

We are for cooperation with all progressive forces advocating the genuine power of the people, a revival of cultural values, and the implementation of the program of Leningrad's self-management. We are with all those to whom concern for Leningraders, veterans, and the younger generation are really close. And whoever rejects the hand we extend, let him not say that the main thing for him is the interests of the people.

The elections to republic and local soviets are not so far off. Who will win them will depend on our sense of responsibility, adherence to principle, and ability to understand people. Orientation toward specific concerns should be the principal criterion in evaluating the future people's candidates. People expect not fine phrases but painstaking daily work on the solution of urgent problems.

Let us remember that only conscientious, highly organized, and disciplined labor and the high responsibility of everyone will lead us to the charted goal—a rise in the living standard.

Our slogan is **"For a Way Out of the Crisis on the Paths of Political Stability and Democracy!"**

We address it to each person to whom the motherland is dear and to whoever recognizes his duty to his fathers and grandfathers and thinks about the future of his children and grandchildren.

Personnel Changes Made

WA1412203889 Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 22 Nov 89 p 3

[Text] Leningrad, TASS—A plenum of the Leningrad Obkom that studied organizational matters was held yesterday.

Yu.F. Yarov, chairman of the Executive Committee of the Leningrad Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies, was elected member of the obkom [oblast party committee] bureau.

V.K. Borisov, first secretary of the Krasnogvardeyskiy Raykom [Rayon Party Committee], was promoted from candidate to member of the obkom.

In connection with his election as deputy chairman of the Leningrad Oblispolkom [Oblast Soviet Executive Committee], V.A. Zubkov was relieved of his duties as head of the obkom agrarian department. I.Ye. Yankovskiy, who had earlier been deputy chairman of the presidium of the V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences Branch for the Non-Chernozem Zone of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, was confirmed in this office.

Leningrad Proletarian Fundamentalists Criticized

PM1312120389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Article by special correspondent Valeriy Vyzhutovich: "Dictatorship by Common Sense. Reflections on the Workers Movement in the Times of Perestroyka"]

[Text] "A thinking proletariat"—that was an expression used by Pisarev [19th century Russian materialist philosopher and revolutionary democrat]. That was the kind of worker—intelligent, dignified, and spiritually autonomous—that the honest and conscientious Russian intellectual dreamed of. It was only later on that we were taught to hate some of our fellow citizens with class hatred.

We seem to have absorbed from the cradle the idea of the worker always being in the vanguard. Fine, but what about today's agricultural scientist, physician, teacher—are they bringing up the rear, by any chance? Nikolay Sivkov, Svyatoslav Fedorov, Shalva Amonashvili.... As soon as abstract ideas are replaced by the names and faces of real people, a "seditious" conjecture immediately springs to mind: It appears possible to march ahead of the rest without being officially classed as belonging to the people's vanguard. And it is probably equally possible to belong to it on paper without doing anything to distinguish yourself. And now about something even more serious: People here and there gather at rallies and

refuse to go down to their coal face, to sit behind their steering wheel, or to man their machine tool.... Who is it that goes on strike—the working class, the most advanced and the most conscientious?

It is a thorny issue. The figure of the worker in our country is the object of very special attention, at times reminiscent of a guard of honor. Let's be blunt about it: In many respects this is deserved and fair. As distinct from Mukhina's stainless steel sculpture, workers in real life knew the meaning of blood and sweat and set examples of extraordinary labor self-sacrifice, for which they were rewarded with scanty rubles, disorganized daily life, and "black" [compulsory working] Saturdays.... Elevated on a public pedestal by Stalin's propaganda, workers in reality enjoyed just one privilege—that of being "cogs" in the rigid mechanism of the administrative edict system. Wages were reduced and norms were hiked in their name, meat prices were raised and holidays were proclaimed workdays "at working people's request...."

The poster image of man with a miner's pick (or a pickax, or a file) in his strong calloused hands, created on orders from the best friend of proletarians of all countries, was for a long time the object of political speculation and social mythology. Even now, while writing these lines, I am making deferential reservations as if trying to observe some canon. In vain: The thinking proletariat does exist in our country and needs no condescension. By coming out in the squares today, declaring its demands, and creating workers' committees, it—the thinking proletariat—is proving convincingly that its mind has already firmly grasped the questions of practical politics.

I observed this law-governed, complex, and in many regards contradictory process in graphic reality in Leningrad.

A leaflet appeared on apartment block walls on 30 October, and I shall let readers judge its content and tone for themselves:

"TO THE WORKERS OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

"...The Soviet Empire is bristling, imperial socialiums [sotsialii] are posing a threat to liberalization.... The supreme power is adopting antidemocratic laws, calling them foundations of a rule-of-law state. If anyone fails to realize that imperial laws are in the interests of the rulers, then let that person go and vote, let that person remain a slave.... No matter whom we elect, there will always be a domineering class which oppresses the workers. It makes no sense to vote for one's oppressors!

"Workers, let us boycott the elections!.."

A boldface annotation above the appeal claimed authorship: "Democratic Workers Movement. Workers' Professional Association 'Independence.'" There was also a notice telling people where to telephone with any questions.

I telephoned and, about half-an-hour later, I was face to face with a robust and self-confident man already past his youth, with a luxuriant and thick graying beard and the fire of impatience in his eyes. His appearance gave the impression of someone detached from the world's vanities. It immediately became apparent that I had made no mistake on that account. But I was wrong about something else: He is not a worker. Leonid Nikolayevich Pavlov is a candidate of economic sciences. He has no job, having dedicated himself, he told me, to the struggle for the workers' cause. He is chairman of "Independence." Its ranks contain just over 100 members.

"We are not chasing quantity," Pavlov said, "we need fighters rather than liberal mouthpieces. Our people are agitating at enterprises, creating a strike readiness."

I asked: Does "Independence" have any other members apart from workers?

"No," was Pavlov's firm answer, "we have only workers. They are waging a class struggle. Are you familiar with the socialium theory?"

And he went on to initiate me in his political teaching.

And so, socialium is the diametrical opposite of capital. Socialium means universally socialized state ownership of the means of production, means of livelihood, jobs, and land. Socialium means a domineering class of oppressors. They are the top persons in the country, the city, the department, the enterprise, the institution. Briefly speaking, the bosses. On the other side of the barricades (this word would be appropriate here) stand the workers and peasants. The oppressed.

"And the intelligentsia? What role does it play?"

"We have no such term," was the answer. "People counting themselves as members of the intelligentsia are nothing but mercenaries of the bureaucracy. Real intellectuals must live like Bunin, like Lev Tolstoy... I have discovered the cycles of state socialium, a large one and a small one. The large one lasts 120 years, and the small one..."

He lapsed into silence. He then asked me austerely:

"Can you guarantee that the transcript of my words will not fall into strange hands? The work has not been published yet, it might be plagiarized...."

I still had my doubts: Was this a practical joke? But next evening, when I took advantage of Pavlov's invitation and arrived at a scheduled meeting of the "Independence" aktiv members, I realized: This was for real.

The association's members assembled in the top floor lobby at the Gorkiy Club. There were 25 of them: A middle-aged decorator from the housing construction combine, a 50-year-old fitter from the "Zarya" Plant, quite a young quality control inspector from the sheet foil plant.... They sat in a circle, and Pavlov introduced a visitor from Vorkuta who had arrived to share experiences. They listened intently, asked questions, every now and then you could hear words like "socialium," "our enemies," "class struggle...."

"If you can support the strike, do so!", Pavlov appealed to those assembled. "Stop work! For 1 hour, for 2 hours, for as long as you can!"

I observed, pondered, and was gripped by an acute sense of alarm caused by this excessive intolerance mixed with elementary political ignorance and a naive, almost religious, belief in the need for class barricades. I felt bitterly disappointed by these people, brilliant in their own way, not stupid, excited by changes and willing them on with all their heart, but totally confused by their leader. They evoked compassion because they had blocked off a real understanding of what is happening by a solid wall erected from whatever material was at hand. And we know what happened to be at hand—the debris of Stalin's class theories; mentors like Pavlov present them as the latest word and try to adapt them to new developments.

At this point someone might probably exclaim: "There you have it, your perestroyka! Is **this** what you want?" No, nobody wants this. And perestroyka has nothing to do with it. This smacks of the years-long tradition which was quite powerfully expressed in the speech by Donbass miner F. Artyukhov at the First All-Union Conference of Stakhanovite Workers: "Yesterday, after visiting our beloved people's commissar, we told ourselves that people who have no desire to work in our fashion should have their heads chopped off—and that will be that...." The applause which erupted at that point was so prolonged that at times it seems to reverberate to this day. I hear it echoing in categorical demands: "Down with thieving cooperative members!", "Power under workers' control!" I can distinguish it in irritated complaints against economic scientists, didactic tutelage to masters of culture, and now in rally complaints about the activity of the Central Committee and the Politburo....

I have no desire to exaggerate the "Independence" Trade Union's influence among Leningrad workers—it is insignificant in practical terms. But its very orientation reflects and supplements certain mental attitudes which, alas, are widespread—and not just on the banks of the Neva. They are dangerous in themselves, but are also dangerous because they prompt an offensive by the other side. The greater the number of those eager to fuel the fire, the more closely rallied and numerous will be the ranks of volunteers carrying fireman's hoses. The louder the calls for a flare-up, the more natural will be the urge to inundate.

Reaction.... It sounds frightening, intimidating. But why should it? It is nothing but a response. Action generates reaction also in social life.

...The recent scheduled conference of the Leningrad United Front of Working People [UFWP] was organized on a grand scale. The podium and stage at the "Yubileynyy" Sports Palace were covered in slogans: "Mass Media—Under Working Class Control!", "The Working Class—Spokesman of the Fundamental Interests of All Working People!.."

Unanimity, rarely encountered nowadays, reigned in the hall. People spoke about the crisis the country is experiencing, the rising prices, the collapse of the economy, and—as was only to be expected—the eternal Russian question was urgently asked: Who is to blame? Names were named: Academicians Abalkin, Aganbegyan, Arbatov, Bogomolov...—every economist from A through Sh (Shmelev). Someone shouted from the floor: "Add Primakov to the list!" They did. And they adopted a resolution: "We demand that they lose their academic pay supplements until such time as we receive constructive economic solutions." Sobchak and almost all Leningrad people's deputies were severely reprimanded for propagandizing "alien" values and ideals from the parliamentary rostrum. MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, and KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA were given rough treatment for similar "sins...." As for LENINGRADSKIY RABOCHIY, it was dealt with in a special, capital manner. One particular article was disliked, and the Council of Workers' Political Clubs "For Leninism and Communist Guidelines for Perestroyka" (the UFWP theoretical center) adopted a resolution:

"...From a newspaper of the Leningrad Oblast CPSU Committee [obkom], the newspaper LENINGRADSKIY RABOCHIY has turned into an organ for the persecution of workers and the sowing of enmity among workers.... The direct culprit is G. Pankov, the newspaper's chief editor and a member of the CPSU. By publishing such material in the Leningrad workers' newspaper, CPSU Member G. Pankov is surrendering the positions of defending the interests of the working class... The City Council of Workers' Political Clubs demands that CPSU Member G. Pankov be dismissed from the office of chief editor, that the editorial office composition be changed, and that the question of Pankov's continued membership in the CPSU be examined...."

Extremes have much in common. "Leftwingers" and "rightwingers" alike prefer the language of ultimatums to normal human speech.

I spoke with Igor Krasavin, assembly worker at the "Russkiy Dizel" Plant and one of the Leningrad UFWP leaders.

"The intelligentsia, well, it includes all sorts," he remarked. "There are those who strive to awaken the working man's awareness, there are others who are like

locusts.... I personally much prefer social scientists who stick firmly to working class positions."

"Scientific positions?" I tried to get this clear.

"No," Krasavin objected. "The class positions of the proletariat. The workers have their own interests. Nobody hands down anything from above, everything has to be struggled for, demanded, fought for!" He got excited, his cheeks flushed. "They don't listen to us, they defame us in the press. There are enemies all around us. Enemies are springing up like mushrooms. Even you, I can sense that you haven't come here for any good purpose. Should this be the case, please quote my words without any commentary."

I promised to do so.

The workers movement is inspired with certain ideas by both sides. Respected scientists, each from his own position, are competing for people's minds. But radical and conservative theoreticians alike, being fundamental and implacable opponents, display amazing similarity and unanimity when it comes to the workers. Unadulterated flattery of the proletariat (which it certainly does not need) and self-disparagement (which a true intellectual also hardly needs) can be heard in speeches by "leftwing" and "rightwing" preachers alike.

Let us listen to what Doctor of Philosophical Sciences M. Popov, chief theoretician of the Leningrad UFWP, has to say: "I think that an intellectual who expresses only himself has not grasped the correlation of class and social forces.... I think that he should not be considered an intellectual at all.... There is an intelligentsia which serves the working class, helps it, and understands its historic role—this is the proletarian, socialist intelligentsia.... The working class, having accomplished the revolution and established its power, also created the socialist intelligentsia. What relations should prevail between the intelligentsia and its progenitor? I think that they ought to be the relations of grateful offspring."

How could anyone object? And there is hardly any need to restate the obvious: The Soviet intelligentsia was shaped from among representatives of the most diverse classes. To attribute its origins to the working class alone would mean sinning against history and offering scope for political speculations.

The excitement with which "conservatives" take workers by the right hand and "radicals" take them by the left hand and try to pull them in different directions is fraught with considerable danger. It was perceived even by M. Gorkiy. In his 11 January 1918 article "To the Intellectual From Among the People," the proletarian writer addressed PRAVDA and warned: "The proletariat without democracy is left hanging in the air, you are pushing democracy away from the proletariat."

It should not happen....

Now we have arrived at the front line. Or to be more accurate Leningrad's double front line—the Leningrad People's Front [LPF] and the UFWP. Workers are substantially, crudely, and prominently represented in both of them. Let us be blunt: The authority and influence of both movements are usually determined more by the opposite side's actions than by its own. In the light of this assertion, I think it is interesting to learn that, according to the figures of the Leningrad Center for the Study and Forecasting of Social Processes, the LPF has over 1 million supporters in the city and the UFWP has around 350,000.

I would also hazard the following supposition: The LPF is dominated by workers who have come to deal with politics, and the UFWP by politicians who have come to deal with workers. Both are useful and necessary, of course, but.... People at rallies and open debates say that the UFWP is influenced by the apparatus and is thereby compromised, as it were. I would not venture to judge whether or not this is so. But nevertheless, one fundamental clarification seems to me to be necessary: What apparatus, precisely? There is no longer any homogeneous, monolithic apparatus any more than there is a homogeneous mass of workers. Society is in motion, and the answer to the question of who is who sounds different in each specific instance.

When people in the city began to say that the Oktyabrskiy CPSU Raykom [Rayon Committee] was involved in and approved of the work of the well known political club "For Leninism and Communist Guidelines for Perestroyka," Raykom Secretary T. Vasilyeva publicly stated her position: "In their opinion, the crux is that the club (and more broadly the entire working class) should act as the universal controller both of the CPSU's activity and of the whole country. And what is effectively engineered here is the idea of a 'firm hand' that would run the country. Hence also the dislike of debate and the tendency to lose sight of other social strata.... Hence also the club's tendency to gravitate toward those representatives of the intelligentsia who themselves espouse the position of a 'firm hand' or at any rate are quick to identify 'opponents' whose activity should be rigidly controlled...."

What about the LPF? Why was it created? What goals does it set itself? An answer to these questions is provided by the manifesto and resolution "On Immediate Tasks" adopted by the constituent congress. These documents indicate that the LPF seeks "to promote the involvement of the broadest strata of the population in active, conscious, organized work to renew all aspects of our society's life." Therefore the LPF regards it as its prime task to recruit to its ranks "representatives of all strata of the working people, primarily workers and rural working people."

The Leningrad party leaders have a clear attitude toward the LPF's activity. What is it? Once again, each has his own attitude. I myself heard Obkom Secretary Yu. Denisov say from the platform of a trade union conference at the "Baltiyskiy Zavod" Production Association:

"There is no question of any democracy in this movement." The speaker thereupon also spoke up resolutely against those who "today defend private ownership" (he named a Central Committee secretary) and "want to encumber us with fat cats."

There you are. The Law on Ownership has only just been referred for nationwide discussion and the obkom secretary, preempting the debate, is already imparting a very specific thrust to it. As for attempts to counterpose the workers to the center, recent events show that these seem to be becoming persistent in Leningrad. Is this necessary? Is it timely?

"We don't want the spontaneous workers movement to end up smashing windows in the Smolnyy," Kirill Boldovskiy said.

To know what you don't want is to have half a program already. And in full it is as follows: "The independence of the workers movement does not mean that the movement formulates any 'special,' 'worker' ideology and policy of its own and does not signify opposition to and rivalry with society's political forces —ranging from the CPSU to various politicized informal associations. On the contrary, cooperating loyally with all political forces, the workers movement introduces into their ideology and policy a link with practice, with the real requirements and needs perturbing the most ordinary of people."

Kirill Boldovskiy is a bricklayer and chairman of the Union of Leningrad Workers Committees. Sociologist Oleg Bite helped formulate the program (as we can see, the union too has its own scientific consultant). Publication of a newspaper has been started; its editors and distributors are workers Aleksandr Takayev and Anatoliy Antonov.

The committee's aim is "to help in resolving labor conflicts without resorting to strikes, wherever possible."

"What about when it's not possible?" I asked Boldovskiy.

"We regard strikes as an extreme measure but a permissible one, although it is better for them not to take place."

Kirill recently went on strike. The foreman made a mistake when they were laying the footings. They came out uneven, and had to be redone. The team was not paid for redoing them. The job schedules were closed, and it cost them R100 each. The foreman said: "Don't be stupid. You've got what you've earned." "Our work clothes are rubbish and you can whistle for soap at the end of the shift! Look, we're going on strike...." "Go ahead and strike, to hell with you."

So the guys went on strike. They came to work at eight as usual, sat around in the locker room smoking and telling jokes, and went home at five. After 4 days they were, no, not given—they were promised soap and new boots. And they were paid R40 each—by way of a raise. The team went back to work the next morning.

There are great numbers of such incidents today. Because of their small scale, they do not get into the press or onto television—they are just petty annoyances against the background of Vorkuta. So they've kicked up a bit of a fuss and let off steam—why tell the whole world about it? But you should tell it, Boldovskiy is sure. The program of the Union of Workers Committees says as follows: "All instances of the infringement of working people's rights and of persecution of them for taking part in the struggle for their rights are to be publicly aired [predavat glasnosti]."

"We proceed from the real situation in the team or at the construction site," Boldovskiy explained. "And we try to avoid political slogans until they emerge from the struggle. But sometimes it is useful to show your strength and organization."

I asked about the guys' view of Pavlov and his "Independence" trade union. Kirill handed me the "Statement of the Leningrad Union of Workers Committees": "A leaflet from the 'Independence' trade union calling on Leningrad's workers to declare 'short solidarity strikes' in support of the Vorkuta miners' strike is being circulated in the city. The leaflet mentions only political demands.... Such rash appeals give the conservative section of the party-state apparatus the opportunity it is waiting for to take harsh retaliatory measures...."

"Everyone is addicted to politics," Boldovskiy told me. "They hold rallies and argue about the rule-of-law state and the separation of powers.... Admittedly, mostly about what Gorbachev and Ryzhkov should do. But come on, do there have to be amendments to the Constitution before you can put up a few pegs in the locker room and fix the shower?"

I don't want to make my interlocutor out to be some kind of simpleton: He understands everything. About the extremely close link between the economy and politics, the fact that one reform is inconceivable without the next, the fact that workers' everyday service facilities will not be the only things that determine our lives tomorrow. And about barracks socialism, the dismantling of which is extremely necessary: Is it conceivable to construct anything new without first clearing the site? But both he and those who share his views firmly know what they don't want: smashed windows, hysterical appeals, thoughtless ultimatums, mutual intolerance, and bitterness. They are motivated by a sober awareness of what is possible and impossible, by a real understanding of what comes first, and what next....

Politics is returning to workers' life from smoking rooms and locker rooms as though from exile. Is society ready for this? After all, there are 82 million people at mines, oil wells, and machine tools....

Perestroyka began "at the top." The workers movement is a mighty offensive "from below." That is its strength.

But that is also a weakness: Since it is not just another approved "initiative," it bothers some people and scares others. Let's get used to it! Get used to the living, thinking proletariat and, overcoming the temptation of self-deception, stop looking to pasteboard heroes exuding banal optimism. The time has come to adapt politics to the workers, rather than adapting the workers to politics.

Society's abandonment of chronic stereotypes in its perception and understanding of the worker also coincides with the vector of historical development: Right from the start of the formation of the proletarian movement K. Marx stressed that the "struggle for the liberation of the working class means fighting not for class privileges and monopolies but for equal rights and obligations...."

When you ponder the fate of the workers movement of the times of glasnost and perestroyka, you come to realize: If the movement is to endure and increase, it cannot be exclusively a workers movement. It is not for nothing, for instance, that the Kuzbass Union of Workers recently changed its name to the Union of Working People. Our hope and support lies only in the consolidation of all healthy social forces.

Workers, peasants, and intellectuals are not in confrontation with each other. They have common problems and a common interest—extricating the country from the impasse, feeding it, and putting it back on its feet. They have been given the tools: the contract, leasing, free elections, the new Soviet parliament.... And when at long last the slogans of the revolution—"Land to the peasants!"; "Plants and factories to the workers!"—are realized, what will be established over one-sixth of the earth's land area in place of obsolete dictatorships will be the only dictatorship that unites all real working people—the dictatorship of action. The dictatorship of common sense.

Draft Law Widens Power of Leningrad Soviet

90UN0407A Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 21 Nov 89 p 2

[Text] LenTASS—The draft USSR law "Extension of the Jurisdiction of the Leningrad City Soviet of People's Deputies in State, Economic, and Sociocultural Building" was examined at a meeting of the Leningrad Gorispolkom [City Soviet Executive Committee] that was held yesterday.

This document provides for a significant extension of the powers of the city soviet in the formation, abolition, establishment, and change in the boundaries of rayons in Leningrad. Under consideration is the according to the Leningrad City Soviet of the right to elaborate and confirm the outline of management of the economy and the right to institute activity pertaining to the creation, reorganization, and liquidation of enterprises, establishments, and organizations that are a part of the local economy.

An important place in the draft law is occupied by problems of the tenure, use, and disposal of land and other natural resources. The independent formation of the city's budget will make it possible to increase within the limits of earned resources spending on health care, public education, culture, and social security.

Lengthy sections in the draft law are allotted to architecture, city planning, foreign economic activity, the protection of historical and cultural monuments, housing and municipal services, and ecological problems.

The executive committee approved the draft USSR law and resolved to submit it for examination by a Leningrad City Soviet session.

The meeting also examined a number of other questions of city life.

Leningrad Draft Action Program Discussed

90UN0407B Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 21 Nov 89 p 1

[Article by the Department of Party and Soviet Building: "School of Realism and Initiative" under the rubric "Party Life: We Discuss the Program of Action"]

[Text] For more than 2 months heated battles and passions have seethed around the Leningrad party organization's draft action program for intensifying perestroyka under current conditions. Some people have actively welcomed this document, seeing it as a dependable basis for the cohesion of Communists on the paths of renewal; some, on the contrary, have evaluated it as a fitting monument to the stagnation era; and some—and such has been the vast majority—have endeavored to insert specific additions and amplifications in it. And now the joint plenum of the Leningrad Obkom [Oblast Party Committee] and Gorkom [City Party Committee] opening today in the Smolnyy must finally dot the "i's". How will the debate take shape? What will the document the plenum adopts be like? What, finally, will it be called—action program or pre-congress, election platform of Leningrad's Communists? We will not have long to wait for the answer.

Meanwhile, let us reflect once more on what the 2-month discussion of the draft program, in which over 400,000 people have participated directly, has meant for all of us, Communists and nonparty people. And this latter figure takes into account, what is more, only those who were present in person at the party and worker meetings which examined the draft and sent their comments thereon to the party authorities or the newspapers. In fact, even if we judge by the numerous telephone calls to our editorial office, the range of participants in the discussion was immeasurably greater, and it may with every reason be maintained today that the action program has in the 2 months undergone a kind of all-Leningrad referendum.

But before speaking of the reflections which it induces and the conclusions it compels, let us ask this: Whence, in general, this invariable interest of Leningraders in the draft program? To be honest, we began its discussion in the newspapers not without apprehensions typical of all editorial offices: What if virtually no one responded to our suggestion that people express their opinion with regard to this document and we had to "organize" responses ourselves. Let's face it, this has happened repeatedly in journalistic practice, and in the case of debate, what is more, which we have intended initiating on far more "no-lose" topics. After all, however important the action program, it is not, for all that, a bestseller that interests and excites everyone.

However, the mail of the first week following publication of the draft dispelled all our misgivings. So many letters, each more interesting than the last, were received that we have been unable to publish them all. And since this has been a constantly growing stream, today, having thanked our readers for their participation in the discussion, we are at the same time forced to apologize to those of them whose responses have not appeared in the paper. Let us say right away: They have not gone to lie without trace in the archives but, like those which were published, were carefully examined and taken into consideration during final editing of the document.

An analysis of the mail which has been coming in for 2 months shows convincingly that the draft program has left practically no categories of Leningraders indifferent. Servicemen and students, engineers and doctors, pensioners and vocational-technical school trainees, workers and teachers, writers and housewives have written to the paper. Of course, this 2-month mass nonindifference, if it may be so put, is largely explained by the politicization of society, which has increased sharply in the years of perestroyka. People have acquired an opportunity to frankly express their opinion, without concealment, on the problems of the life of the party and the state, and are doing so.

Nonetheless, we believe that such an explanation would be incomplete. The steady interest in the draft action program was evoked also, in our view, by the fact that even now Leningraders see no force other than the party which could head the work on the solution of the very difficult socioeconomic problems confronting the city and oblast.

Incidentally, the nature and tone of the responses to the draft themselves also testify to this. However sharp at times the criticism contained in them of this proposition or the other of the document under discussion, the lion's share of them was imbued with sincere concern to ensure that the Leningrad Communists' action program become, following collective adjustment, more clear-cut, radical, and realistic and better serve the aims and tasks of perestroyka.

In other words, the debate in connection with the draft showed that the Leningrad party organization, in spite of everything, continues, as before, to enjoy a credit of trust among the working people and that it needs to do everything possible and impossible to raise this credit even more in the crucial period of preparation for the 28th CPSU Congress and the elections to the republic and local soviets of people's deputies.

Clearly, it is necessary in striving for this to primarily take the initiative into one's own hands, as they say, and head the processes of renewal which are occurring in society. After all, it was to the lagging behind of these processes that many participants in the discussion of the draft also pointed with disquiet and which has also caused to a large extent both the present decline in the party's authority among the people and the absence of the proper unity in its own ranks.

But even here, as the debate concerning the draft program shows, particularly in the final weeks of preparation for the joint obkom and gorkom plenum, the ice has seemingly begun to break. Whoever has followed our newspaper closely has surely noticed that an ever-increasing number of communications from the party organizations began to appear therein as the plenum approached. These were resolutions of party meetings of enterprises and establishments and raykom [rayon party committee] plenums, where in the course of discussion of the draft program alternative versions thereto were adopted and specific demands of the higher party authorities, including the CPSU Central Committee, and proposals pertaining to the agenda of the 28th party congress were made. There were also reports of mass meetings and other actions of Leningrad's Communists, which made a high-minded evaluation of the situation in the party and the country.

There can be only one conclusion from all this: Many party organizations of the city and the oblast are now no longer what they were just a few months ago. They no longer wish to swim with the tide and trail along in the rear of events and are making their presence felt with full voice and taking the initiative into their own hands.

Also different now, it would seem to us, is the entire oblast party organization as a whole, as is, if you will, the Leningrad Obkom and Gorkom apparatus also. And sufficiently convincing confirmation of this is the new version of the action program born in the process of its 2-month discussion. We have already had an opportunity to partially tell the readers that this version is considerably more constructive and bolder than its predecessor submitted for extensive discussion in September. It is more precisely in keeping with the topics of the day and the pressing problems of perestroyka, and Leningraders will soon have an opportunity to see this for themselves.

But we would like now to emphasize something else: All the changes to this document were made with regard for the opinions of the participants in the discussion of the draft, our opinions. There is no denying that this also is unprecedented. But sincere, real consultation with the

people has not yet, as is known, let anyone down. Let us hope it will not let down the oblast party organization either and will enable it, taking the adopted program as a basis, to better mobilize Leningraders' efforts in the struggle for an extension of perestroyka, the more so in that thousands, hundreds of thousands of them will with every justification be able to consider this document theirs also.

However, the main thing is surely, for all that, not whether every last one of our proposals has been taken into consideration in the final version of the program. They may be and should even be implemented in one's own collective, one's own party organization. It is far more important that in discussing this document we have all attended a good school of political realism and initiative and have come to recognize in even greater depth that all the problems of the region and its party organization, our own problems, may be solved successfully only in the course of joint, collective practical work.

It is to be expected that it is such a tone that will be set for the work awaiting all of us, in the process of which the action program itself will also be enriched by the joint plenum which opens today.

Lithuanian Party Plenum Called for 15 Dec

LD1512040189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0300 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] A plenum of the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party will take place today in Vilnius. The participants will discuss certain questions pertaining to preparations for the extraordinary 20th Congress of the republic's Communist Party, which will commence work 19 December.

Yazov, Lithuanian Deputies View Military Service

LD1412163489 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1100 GMT 14 Dec 89

[From the "Press Review" program, presented by A. Usas: interview by telephone with People's Deputy Egidijus Bickauskas, in Moscow, by Correspondent J. Valanciute; date not given—recorded]

[Text] [Valanciute] Our listeners already know that after the working day of the congress had concluded, our deputies met with Comrade Yazov at the Lithuanian represenation in Moscow.

[Bickauskas] That is right. There was such a meeting, not only with Comrade Yazov, but also with a greater part of the brass hats, who took part in this meeting too. Somebody counted them; there were (?nine) army generals. Thus, the representation on their part was rather impressive.

A greater part of our deputies took part in the meeting, among them Professor V. Landsbergis, Esteemed A. Brazauskas, Beriozovas, and Sakalauskas.

Most of army issues which we find pressing were discussed. I would not say that this meeting was especially fruitful in terms of results because no radical cardinal solutions were found. Perhaps it was useful only because we heard Comrade Yazov's direct answer that the general officers do not have any concrete plans in the future to change the regulations concerning the recruitment of young men to do military service. Neither was there any talk about national military formations, saying that this was impossible, that all this was linked to and could be achieved only after an appropriate political decision has been made.

Well, perhaps it was also useful for the fact that he confirmed his inclination to send our young men, as many of them as possible to do military service in the Baltic military region and regions in the vicinity. He confirmed this. He also made a concrete promise that if our young men were sent to far distant areas to do military service, to military units which by their name were connected with Lithuania, then they would not be sent by one or several; a group of a hundred, as a minimum, would be sent; The meeting lasted about 2 hours.

[Valanciute] You say—will be sent—and so on. When is this future tense to become the present tense?

[Bickauskas] In my mind, this is already happening, even now.

[Valanciute] We have already heard such promises before.

[Bickauskas] I think that in this part, where he spoke about sending in groups, sending as many as possible to the Baltic military region, I think this promise will be fulfilled. At least it looked that way.

Another thing is that no-statute relations were also discussed. On this point, he said that one should contact him personally, at almost any time of the day or night, concerning any such issue. All the rest, as I said, demanded political solutions.

Kaunas Executive Committee Resigns

LD1412133589 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1000 GMT 13 Dec 89

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] An unprecedented event took place in Kaunas last week. The second plenum of the Kaunas city party organization proposed that the entire Executive Committee of Kaunas resign. The case indeed is unprecedented in the history of any city in Lithuania.

How did the employees of the Executive Committee react to the proposal? The position of Petras Staskunas, who is currently chairman of the Kaunas Executive Committee, should be decided by the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet because he is a deputy. So neither the city party committee nor the city executive committee could resolve the matter concerning him.

However, all his deputies agreed to resign. [passage omitted] What is incriminating about the Kaunas city leaders, and how did they get into such a crisis? Allocations for private house construction have been distributed in a way that neither the basis for distribution nor the beneficiaries' identity is clear. R114,000 were spent on repairs to a house in Cvirka Street where some godfathers of the city live, while virtually three times less than this sum was spent on repairs to municipal apartments in the whole city during the same period of 9 months. [passage omitted] Rumors are spreading in Kaunas to the effect that all these persons are the shareholders of some 10 [word indistinct] of Kaunas city. I repeat, this is only a rumor. [passage omitted]

Lithuania Bans Removal of Archives

LD1412175789 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1000 GMT 12 Dec 89

[Summary] The Presidium of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet has decided that "in order to ensure the safety of all documents held in the territory of Lithuania which belong to state or departmental offices, including those of all-union subbordination, and which have historical value the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] has decided to entrust the Council of Ministers of the Lithuanian SSR with the task of presenting a bill on the Lithuanian archives for discussion at the 16th session of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet of the 11th convocation;

"To ban the destruction or removal of archive documents regardless of their date of expiry which belong to state or departmental offices situated on the territory of Lithuania until the Law on Archives is approved."

Latvian Local Election Results Announced

LD1512113589 Moscow TASS in English 1118 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] Riga December 15 TASS—The results of the first round of elections to Latvian local councils last Sunday have been announced. A total of 12,732 deputies (87.27 per cent) have been elected. There are still 1,854 places to compete.

One and a half million voters (77.5 per cent) participated in the elections. People were more active in the countryside (84.5 per cent) than in the republican capital (70.2 per cent).

83 per cent of the elected deputies are ethnic Latvians. The three fourth of candidates were Latvians.

24 out of 36 candidates, heads of city and regional party committees, won in the elections. Four candidates will have to participate in the second round of elections. Eight are out of competition.

Further Election Results

LD1412212889 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 14 Dec 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] At today's session of the Latvian Central Electoral Commission the results of the elections were summed up. A total of 77% of the electorate took part in it.

At the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, a TASS correspondent was told that in all the republic, out of 117 secretaries of party gorkoms and raykoms and chairmen of the executive committees who ran for election, 66 were elected. A total of 18 candidates have to continue the struggle for their deputy's mandates. Letts comprise three-fourths of the candidates for deputies. A total of 34% of the candidates were women.

The second round of elections is planned for December 17. This report will be published in the press in greater detail.

Results Examined

LD1412150689

[Editorial Report] Riga in Latvian to Europe at 2130 GMT on 13 December broadcasts as part of its "Amber Coast" program, an unidentified correspondents' interview with (Teodor Zags) chairman of the Riga municipal election commission, and (Maris Steins), head of the People's Front election center, on the results of elections to the Supreme Soviet. The correspondent opens by noting that Riga, being the capital, where nearly one-half of Latvia's inhabitants live, contained the greatest ethnic disparities and the widest political spectrum in the republic. Therefore, it was the focal point of interest regarding the elections.

(Zags) outlines the election process in Riga. There were 496 candidates in 120 constituencies, with anywhere from 1-15 candidates per constituency. The election commission completed its work only the night before. Deputies were registered at 65 constituencies. A repeat ballot will be conducted in 50 constituencies on 17 December. As far as known at present, the elections will be repeated, starting everything anew in five constituencies. It has been decided to hold these on 4 February. No illegalities or illegal results occurred in any of the constituencies, only several complaints, which had been dealt with. There were observers from all public and public/political groups, as well as confidants of candidates at all 314 polling stations. The results of the repeat ballot can be expected around the middle of next week.

(Steins) says that a People's Front majority was achieved at practically all rural rayons, and even in places where a repeat ballot is to be conducted this majority will not be lost. Daugavpils, where there was a very serious defeat, was an exception; only two candidates supported by the People's Front were elected to fill any of the 120 places there. In Riga, on the other hand, at both rayon soviets

and the city soviet, a majority for candidates supported by the People's Front was achieved following the first stages of the elections. He says: "Contrary to our concern, a great many non-Latvians voted precisely for candidates supported by the People's Front," which improved the results, as did the activity of the People Front in preparing the elections. Frequently, however, the results were influenced negatively by the various transgressions permitted in the work of election commissions which, unfortunately, could not be recorded and protested, if only because there were only seven dictophones and no video equipment at the disposal of the election center for the entire republic. The People's Front tactics will not change for the second stage of the elections, but there should be more active work because the experience of previous elections showed that second-stage results usually are worse. (Steins) appeals to all inhabitants to attend polling stations on 17 December. There will be more information about the candidates not yet elected in PADOMJU JAUNATNE on Friday. Asked about his year's work with Supreme Soviet elections, he explains that the Supreme Soviet's main task will be to insure that Latvia recovers its independence as soon as possible and therefor the Supreme Soviet deputies will not so much have to defend the interests of only the rayon that elected them, but will have to work in one of the three directions: sorting out relations with Moscow, sorting out relations outside the country, and sorting out legislative work at the Latvian Supreme Soviet itself. All these aspects should be taken into account when nominating candidates and considering their capabilities for these tasks. There are people who regard that Latvia's independence can be achieved by voting once and proclaiming Latvia independent, but life has proved that this will be a lasting, patience-demanding, and most importantly, professional job.

Latvian Paper Condemns 1939-41 Treaties

LD1412192489 Riga in Latvian to Europe 2130 GMT 13 Dec 89

[Text] At the end of last week the LITERATURA UN MAKSLA newspaper carried the conclusion of a working gorup of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet commission on the events of 1939 and 1940 in Latvia. The commission's working gorup acquainted itself with documents and other materials connected with the international legal status of the Republic of Latvia and the USSR, and also with the mutual legal relations of these states, then on aggression treaty between Germany and the USSR of August 1939 and the secret additional protocol attached to it, the Germany-USSR treaty of 28 September on friendship and borders and the secret additional protocols and a map attached to it.

The commission has analyzed these documents and materials from juridical and historical standpoints, and has also evaluated their political and juridical consequences. It is stated in the conclusion that Stalinism and Hitlerism by secret deals and aggression destroyed independent states. A majority of these states have restored their independence, but Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania until now have not yet recovered their independence.

As a result of the Stalinist regime established in Latvia crimes against humanity and also war crimes were committed against the Latvian people and other peoples of Latvia.

Realization of the illegal treaties of 1939-1941 between the USSR and Germany and of the secret additional protocols attached to them is an international crime.

Riga Gorkom Advises Against Party Split

90UN0417A Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 28 Nov 89 p 4

[Declaration by the Bureau of the Riga City Committee of the Communist Party of Latvia]

[Text] Recently, the work on setting up various factions and organizing an entirely independent new political party has been expedited in a number of party organiztions of the republic and in some party raykoms [rayon committees] under the seemingly respectable excuse of renewing the Communist Party of Latvia; the idea of leaving the CPSU which is being advertised may make an unfavorable impact on the preservation of the unity of its ranks.

The fact that such activity is proceeding with all its force in a destructive direction just at the time when the Latvian program of actions for consolidation indicated the start of a progressive process calls for serious concern.

The Bureau of the Riga Gorkom [city party committee] considers that selecting such a path of renewal could bring about not only a real split in the party, but also an intensification of this process in society, and influence the fate of perestroyka and essential interests of the Latvian people. Is this what should interest the communists, defending the priorities of general human values?

One can not fail to see that the purpose of this campaign is to divert our forces from the pre-election struggle and from the implementation of the ideas of putting the republic on to the path of economic accountability, self-government, and self-financing. Such actions are also a destabilizing factor in international relations.

The bureau of the party gorkom believes and continues to believe that the only way of consolidating society must be the elimination of current disagreements, strict observance of party discipline, preservation of organizational and ideological unity of the party, and the search for ways of mutual understanding and close cooperation on the basis of the Action Program of the Communist Party of Latvia.

We call for rejecting the dangerous confrontational plans, to concentrate the main effort on curing the

situation, enhancing the authority of the Latvian Communist Party, and preparing for holding the congress. At present, this is exactly the main task and moral duty of all the communists of the republic.

We are firmly convinced that the regular congress of the Communist Party of Latvia must come up with answers to a number of burning issues of the day—the status of the Communist Party of Latvia within the CPSU, the unity of party ranks. The forum of communists of the republic must also examine the Action Program of the Communist Party of Latvia aimed at assuring a real sovereignty of the republic in the renewed federation and additions to and changes to the CPSU statute.

We call on communists of the city of Riga to maintain calm and restraint, not to lose faith in the victory of prudence and common sense, be guided by principles in implementing the course of the 19th All-Union Party Conference.

Latvian Interfront Officials Interviewed

90UN0345A Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 17 Nov 89 p 4

[Report on interview with Interfront officials A.G. Alekseyev and A.K. Belaychuk by V. Dubrovskiy: "Interfront: Heading for the Congress"]

[Text] A congress of the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Workers International Front will be held in mid-January 1990—this decision was made at a recent session of the IF [International Front] Republic Council. A number of other questions concerning the state of affairs both in the republic and in the movement itself was examined.

This was the subject of an interview conducted by a SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA correspondent with A.G. Alekseyev, chairman of the Interfront Presidium, and Presidium member A.K. Balaychuk.

[Alekseyev] However important the question of the next Interfront congress, this was, nonetheless, not the most important issue. The main attention was paid to the activity of the worker commissions formed immediately following the organizational structuring of the IF. It was proposed restructuring their work with regard for the specific tasks confronting the movement in the changed situation.

[Balaychuk] It was a question of the need for precisely delimiting the writ of the Council, the Presidium, the Rayon Council Chairmen Committee and the Auditing Commission.

[Dubrovskiy] The intensity of the debate was most likely very high since just the second day after the session the editorial office was receiving calls from readers asking whether the Interfront had split during the council session.

[Alekseyev] I will hasten to reassure your readers. The reason for the keenness of the debate was the lively, concerned discussion of the work of each commission and the Presidium. Frankly, no one, myself included, remained uncriticized at the session. But, nonetheless, even given the nonconcurrence of views, we ultimately found common solutions, proceeding from our basic positions.

[Balaychuk] It was indeed a serious discussion. Not all members of the council were satisfied with individual results thereof. I myself, specifically, consider unjustified the abolition of the commission dealing with sociological research and the formation of some others. But, nonetheless, collective decisions were adopted on this score.

I wish to emphasize that the council session was held with the great assertiveness of the representatives of our primary organizations, who are changing from the role of simple passive observers to the category of active participants in the movement.

[Dubrovskiy] Consequently, it may be concluded that not simply a new intake but people wishing and knowing how to work have joined the commissions.

[Alekseyev] We very much hope so. It is important that considerable numbers of both commission chairmen and the Presidium itself have been replaced. It was decided per a proposal of the organizing group that each member of the Republic Council is obliged to participate in the work of a commission. This, I believe, will make it possible to avoid "ceremonial generals" in the council itself. It should be observed that the Presidium now incorporates the chairmen of the rayon councils of Riga and the biggest cities of republic jurisdiction. [Dubrovskiy] Among the minuses which have come to light in the period that has elapsed since the First IF Congress we may most likely cite the highly inadequate work with the youth, insufficient ties to the work force, a certain lag in the forecasting of the political situation....

[Alekseyev] The list of miscalculations could, alas, be continued. And this also was a subject of discussion at the IF Republic Council session. As far as the said areas are concerned, a youth commission and a commission for work with the unions and worker movements have now been formed. I believe that the members of these and other commissions will take account of the criticism and wishes which were heard addressed to them. Incidentally, we propose publishing a full list in our newssheet YEDINSTVO.

[Dubrovskiy] It is logical to assume that the council's decisions take account also of the situation which has taken shape in the republic since the Second Latvian People's Front (LPF) Congress?

[Balaychuk] We confined ourselves in this connection to receiving information. The point being that we are well informed as to the work of the congress, but the documents in their final version have yet to be published so we refrained from more comprehensive discussion. A

detailed analysis will follow. But we nonetheless noted the main thing—the LPF is for a bourgeois republic and the priority of private ownership....

Many people have been forced to ponder this fact seriously. The People's Front congress opened on USSR Constitution Day. And "in honor" of this, evidently, the congress' organizers lowered on the flagpoles of the House of Political Education the national flags of the USSR and the Latvian SSR. And national banners were hoisted in their place. We now inquire of the government how it will react to such a brazen violation of the law.

[Dubrovskiy] The position of opponent of the People's Front can clearly be traced in IF activity. Does it not seem to you that in becoming preoccupied with this you are involuntarily narrowing the sphere of your interests, being distracted from business and losing possible supporters where there are those who are fluctuating?

[Alekseyev] We are trying to defend citizens' rights enshrined in the USSR Constitution and human rights proclaimed in international documents. And this is the line beyond which we cannot retreat. For example, we will never be able to accede to a draft citizenship law which provides for discrimination against USSR citizens and other similar laws and decrees.

[Balaychuk] We will not be able to renounce what you have called the position of opponent. Although we might agree that such efforts sometimes have an effect on the constructivism of our steps. Too much time is being spent explaining the IF's positions. After all, the media are still paying considerably more attention to the People's Front. We possess in practice merely the YEDINSTVO newssheet, which is published, with great difficulty, as before, in Daugavpils. Besides this, the 15-minute weekly radio bulletin "Point of View," which is continually being shortened without explanation. The people working in radio have recently been resorting to one further method: they have begun in the time allotted us to comment on our topics heard just before in such a way as to completely distort their content.

[Alekseyev] We have for a long time now been struggling for IF access to television, but, despite all the promises of the republic leadership, we have not yet managed this. As a result we cannot publicly explain our positions on the most pressing issues and alter the distorted impression concerning the Interfront foisted on some of the population of our republic.

[Dubrovskiy] Nonetheless, one has the impression that journalists have begun to pay more attention to the Interfront. There have been series of interviews in RIGAS BALSS, on television and in other of the media. Are these attempts at a dialogue?

[Balaychuk] Would that they were. It is simply, in my view, that some journalists are changing tactics. Whereas formerly the whole of the IF was presented in a distorted light, the main blow now is being struck at certain of its leaders. The purpose is the same—by means of every conceivable manipulation to show them in an unattractive light and as enemies of the people virtually. Incidentally, this has been noticed by Western journalists also, who have recently been displaying an entirely understandable interest in us and who are more objective than local journalists.

[Dubrovskiy] It is known that any organization, having stabilized its position, inevitably passes through phases of an upturn and decline in activity. Internal contradictions arise also. Much was said about such phenomena in the LPF at its second congress. The Interfront is no exception here, I believe?

[Alekseyev] Generally, no. Our activity most likely peaked in the winter and spring. Then came the holiday period, which reduced activity. Nonetheless, much was done even in this period.

Our representatives participated in the constituent congress of the USSR United Workers Front, which was held in Leningrad, visited Estonia and Lithuania frequently and established contacts with the work force of Moldavia, Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev and a number of cities of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]. Orders were placed at Riga enterprises with our assistance for the manufacture of unique equipment necessary for municipal purification installations totaling R130,000. Good relations have been established with the "Charity" movement also.

Mention should also be made of the following detail: We have found an outlet on Leningrad television and radio, which now regularly broadcast programs prepared by our specialists. And the fact that the LPF has recently been changing its tactics on individual issues also indicates that it is having to come to terms with Interfront. We have demanded of the authorities a revision of certain discriminatory provisions of new laws and decrees, and the first results are to hand—the republic Supreme Soviet has supported the abrogation of a number of discriminatory articles.

[Balaychuk] To speak of the reasons for a certain falling-off in the work of the IF, this means primarily, let us be self-critical, the absence of open dialogue within the IF, in the press included. This has not always allowed us to adopt prompt decisions under the conditions of the rapidly changing situation in the republic. And considerable numbers of Interfront participants have seen the lack of diversity in tactics and inadequate glasnost in the work of the IF as a slide to the right. This was also manifested to some extent at the council session just held.

We are frequently told that it is a long time since such big marches as that of 23 February have been seen. But we consider that both 100,000-strong demonstrations and strikes are extreme measures. For this reason we need to be circumspect in having recourse to them. Conventional work, on the other hand, should be based on the neighborhoods and on the stimulation of people locally.

[Dubrovskiy] Proceeding from what has been said, it could be concluded that some members of Interfront perfectly justifiably fear a bureaucratization of its machinery and the manifestation of individual features of authoritarianism in its activity.

[Alekseyev] I am forced to agree with you. Such a danger lies in wait, probably, for any public movement. And much was said about this, in acute form at times, at the session of our council. Frankly, the response to the criticism has been inadequate. Although a few days later I personally came to the conclusion that the best medicine for this ailment is candid, direct discussion. We have common goals, after all.

[Balaychuk] Yes, we are of like mind for the Interfront supports the values of genuine socialism, in the Leninist understanding, the sovereignty of Latvia and each of our republics within a renewed Soviet federation and human rights. But this does not mean and cannot mean the like-mindedness of all on all issues. Pluralism of opinions is inevitable and is to be encouraged. For we all know in what the recent bogus unanimity in the stagnation period resulted for the people. And I believe that groups may exist perfectly well. But on the one condition that each of them organizes its activity on the basis of the IF Statutes and Declaration. We will always be able to collate. But unless there is freedom of thought and the right of choice of path, we will inevitably change from being a movement into an ossified structure.

[Alekseyev] I personally am opposed to permanent groups. I believe that there may be various proposals on each issue discussed. Temporary groups, which might at a given moment suggest the optimum solution, will most likely take shape. The main thing is that as large a number of people as possible take part in the discussion.

[Dubrovskiy] It is most likely no accident that these issues have acquired so ringing a resonance precisely now, on the eve of the elections to the local soviets?

[Alekseyev] Undoubtedly. It is highly profitable to those who will contend with us at the elections to foist endless debate on the IF. This is why the Republic Council advocated at its session by absolute majority the creation of a common IF election platform. To what unthinking amateur activity could lead is shown by the business involving the placard of a group of authors who, without coordination with our ideological commission, composed the wording of the placard and duplicated it. This afforded people with an uncontrollable imagination to see therein what was not there also.

[Balaychuk] The election campaign is truly a good school. And here also the unity of our ranks and their assertiveness should perform the main role. Incidentally, in order to finally put an end to all inventions I wish to observe that, proceeding from unity, at their session the members of the Republic Council supported me and passed a vote of confidence in the chairman of the IF Presidium. Of the 78 persons, 70 voted for him.

[Dubrovskiy] The Second People's Front Congress showed that the period of euphoria is on the wane. Does it not seem to you that under these conditions the opportunities for dialogue between your movements have increased somewhat....

[Alekseyev] We have never refused dialogue, nor specific joint action. And it is not our fault that a number of IF proposals has not been accepted by the LPF leadership. At the recent Latvian Communist Party Central Committee plenum I once again proposed cooperation in the solution of the most pressing questions of the life our republic. But no response, alas. The same fate befell the Interfront's proposal concerning the joint elaboration and implementation of a program for instruction in Latvian.

[Balaychuk] Yes, it may now be said that euphoria and dialogue are incompatible. What might the subject of the dialogue be? Latvia's withdrawal from the USSR does not seem to me an end of the LPF but a means toward an end. Our end, however, are the ideals of a socialism purged of distortions whereby each individual is in himself the highest value for society. We will hardly conduct a dialogue on the subject of to whom of the former owners to return the nationalized factory. But we do need to ponder together how to transfer property to the workforce and make it the master of the enterprise. And in just the same way we need to think about how to protect it even now against the bureaucracy.

One further topic would be how to harmonize interests common to all mankind and national interests in the country and in the republic. What is the "transitional period" of the new LPF program: Does it mean civil war or civil peace? How is this civil peace, say, to be achieved? By way of the creation of autonomous areas (as in Lithuania) and communities united by the language of communication (Estonia) or will new political refugees (Fergana) emerge, perhaps? I believe that in our republic we have it within us to together avoid aggravation which nobody wants. So there are sufficient topics for dialogue. And we are prepared for it.

[Dubrovskiy] Thank you for the interview.

Latvian Draft Citizenship Law Criticized

90UN0279A Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 22 Oct 89 p 2

[Article by legal experts L. Pshennikova and K. Matveyev and economist O. Vovk: "A Matter of Honor and Dignity?"]

[Text] If we are to judge from the favorable reviews which have appeared recently in the republic press, the draft Law on Citizenship should suit just about everybody. Those dissatisfied with it are represented in the periodicals chiefly as radical elements demanding that still fewer allowances be made for postwar "migrants" and their offspring. In a law-governed state, however, there is no mistake more crude than to make decisions of

state citing a last-minute surge of "letters from the working class" advocating one view. The application of law must proceed not from emotions, even if these have seized an appreciable segment of the population, nor from political opportunism, but from the humanistic principles of true democracy, from a strategy of law.

What strikes you immediately when you read the draft law? The absence of conceptual unity in the premises, lack of strict judicial logic, a non-democratism in many of the most important provisions. In a number of instances, judicial terminology has been replaced with categories of ethics and current politics. An ambiguity in absolutely essential concepts allows them to be interpreted quite arbitrarily, depending on political trends. There are clear attempts to reconcile ideas on sovereignty from the DNNL [Movement for the National Independence of Latvia] point of view with ideas on the sovereignty of a member state of the Soviet federation. Examples? Here are some.

Right in Article 1, "Definition of Citizenship of the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]," the definition itself is essentially lacking. "Firm political and legal linkage" is thrown out in passing and defined as "loyalty of a citizen to the republic," and the high-flown "matter of honor and dignity of a citizen" replaces the proper concept of citizenship.

Citizenship is actually the legal status of an individual, his condition as a citizen, and is primarily a **two-way** relationship comprising **reciprocal obligations** on the part of the state authority and subject individual—the patronage of the state shown to its citizen both inside and outside the country, the investiture in him of all rights in their entirety, protected to the utmost degree. And on the other hand—the unconditional observance by the citizen of the laws and orders of the state.

The draft law shows an essential defect in the fact that, in legally constructing the institution of Latvian SSR [Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic] citizenship, the authors inserted notorious flaws of undemocratic legal systems. The text shows as a precondition for citizenship the archaic "innovation" of residency requirements (Article 22), which highly civilized states are gradually retreating from, either abandoning them altogether or reducing them to a symbolic minimum. Moreover, the draft law raises this to its absolute and attributes, in essence, a retroactive force to the requirement (Article 2, point 3).

Questions arise here of their own accord. How did the authors of the draft legislation manage to snatch away the lower limit (5, 10 years? Perhaps more?)? Who established, and on the basis of what scientific data, how much time is required—even for the statistical average—for an individual to adapt to conditions of a different living environment, to begin to find his bearings in the society and adequately react to local conditions?

We recall that the legislators devoted far less time for assimilation of the state language—3 years. They presume a language capability for everyone regardless of education, age, or sex. So it turns out that civic abilities blossom for permanent residents only after 5 or 10 years of living in the republic? Strange logic.

Instead of a clear and precise formulation of Latvian SSR citizenship requirements, firstly with respect to USSR citizens permanently residing in Latvian territory at the moment the law goes into effect, and, secondly, regarding all those who will be accepted for Latvian citizenship (whose rights of citizenship will be restored) as the law becomes effective, we are presented with four casuistic points whose purpose is, probably, to prove that the development of Latvia was interrupted on 21 July 1940. If this reference point is not ambiguous, then it is arbitrary, in any event. Why do we not start with the establishment of the **very first** form of Latvia's national statehood—the "Iskolat Republic"?

It is only necessary to compare, for example, Part II of Article 16 with Part III of Article 22 of the draft to notice that descendants of the citizens of bourgeois Latvia desiring citizenship in the Latvian SSR (wherever they might be today) have priority over second-generation descendants of Latvian SSR natives who live in the USSR outside Latvian territory.

The sense of Part III, Article 22 can be interpreted any which way: "Residency requirement is waived, with respect to approval of Latvian SSR citizenship, for people from among the **colonists** (What colonies? Established where, when, and by whom?), **refugees** (coming from where, when, from whom?), citizens **persecuted for revolutionary activity** (in what revolution, persecuted by whom?), and **displaced persons** who left the territory of Latvia **prior to or following** the Great October Socialist Revolution (and how should we understand this?) and their descendants." **Author's** quotation marks are used here and for the remainder of the article in excerpting from the draft law)

Had those who drafted the legislation taken the norm of legal civilization as their basis—that citizens of the Latvian SSR and all USSR citizens permanently residing in the republic, as well as those who will henceforth be granted citizenship **on common grounds**—he would have avoided the casuistic and incomprehensible enumeration of people far "more equal" than others.

In Article 14 ("Questions of Dual Citizenship") the authors of the draft daringly compare the possibility of maintaining Latvian SSR citizenship while acquiring foreign citizenship and—simultaneously—that of being doomed to lose Latvian SSR citizenship if accepted as a citizen of another union republic. It turns out that a person who acquires Canadian citizenship, for example, remains a citizen of the Latvian SSR with all its rights and responsibilities (voting, for example), while the person who moves to, let us say, the nearest city in Belorussia and becomes a citizen there automatically

ceases to be a Latvian SSR citizen, even if he continues to maintain extremely close ties. The situation is complicated by the fact that present legislation in the union republics stipulates that permanent residence of a USSR citizen in a certain republic denotes his citizenship there. Thus, the right to choose in this context turn into a fiction, while the prospect of automatic loss of Latvian citizenship in conjunction with moving to another union republic becomes quite real....

In our view, Article 14 should proclaim unambiguously that the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic does not recognize dual (the Latvian SSR and some other foreign state simultaneously) citizenship in principle. If we insert into the law the most democratic and logical premise—that citizens of the Latvian SSR are, firstly, all those USSR citizens permanently living in the territory of the republic at the moment the law becomes effective and, secondly, people approved for Latvian SSR citizenship based on general principles and without residency requirements—the nonrecognition of dual citizenship will impart stability and finality to the institution of republic citizenship.

There is a tendency in the world today to reduce the number of so-called "bi-patriots." According to international law, a person who possesses more than one citizenship cannot refuse to fulfill civic responsibilities in his country of permanent residence by citing his duty regarding another state. The 1930 Hague Conference provides that citizenship of only one state is recognized on the territory of a third state. The problem of dual citizenship was examined by the United Nations Commission on International Law, which drew up draft provisions for decreasing instances of dual citizenship and eliminating it in the future. One of the key provisions here was that **acceptance of citizenship of another state results in loss of the previous citizenship.** And so we return to what has been attained in the legal thought of the world, something the authors of the draft legislation often advise in their commentary. Striving to grasp what is best from the international arena, the USSR has concluded bilateral agreements with almost all the socialist countries on eliminating instances of dual citizenship and on measures to avoid this in the future.

Insofar as Article 14 of the republic draft law is detailed for the future, the coming increase in rights of bi-patriots in the republic means inevitably that the number of bi-patriots in the USSR will increase—after all, every citizen of the republic is also a citizen of the USSR according to Article 3. But this contradicts the efforts of the Soviet Union underway for several years now with respect to the progressive trends of international law.

As Article 14 is inexplicable from the point of view of legal logic, the concept set forth in Article 4 and a number of more particular articles is inexplicable as well from a position of consistent democratism—the notorious orientation on creating "Soviet stateless persons." People deprived of citizenship on the basis of a 10- or even 5-year residency requirement do not automatically again receive citizenship in the republics they came from. Consideration of analogous laws is not in the agenda of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] or the Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]; and if such were to appear, we do not know what they would look like. Thus, we see being created a unique **status of some kind of abstract federation citizen, who is not a citizen of any of its component parts.**

But let us return to the issue of the residency requirement. If the number of people denied their civic rights (based on mathematics) turns out to be **just several percent** of the total population of republic inhabitants, then we do not understand why this strange undertaking is being made, excluding these people from normal political life. If we conservatively convert these small percentages into absolute figures, then **"just"** is transformed into tens and hundreds of thousands of people, who are deprived of what they had up until that moment. It would be naive to think they will all abandon Latvia. Whether knowingly or not, the legislator is inserting a colossal amount of dissatisfaction into the "law-governed state" and is charging the law with the risk of social outburst. For the sake of what?

Oh, what an unpleasant memory is that habit of working with the silent "masses," gauging human rights in population percentages, and seeing in each person an elementary particle of the insipid throng or, if you will, a statistic whose fate is decided by the number denoting his place in the "relocated contingent...." The Latvian people, like other people, have come to know the "dignity" of such an approach. What is this which the vigilant point 4 of Article 23 of the draft law proposes to propagate through the punishment of denying "an object of honor and dignity," if not real Stalinism?

The provisions of several other norms of the law are filled with similar vices from yesterday. Article 28 ("Expulsion From Latvian SSR Territory") sets down the possibility (somewhat transparently) of deporting individuals displeasing to the authorities, any kind of "troublemaker": in contrast to a citizen of the Latvian SSR, whom it is impossible to deport from the republic, "a person deprived of Latvian SSR citizenship can, **with the consent of the accepting union republic (?)**, be expelled from the territory of the Latvian SSR."

It has become apparent today that decisions to deprive certain individuals of Soviet citizenship and expel them abroad were unjust acts of arbitrary rule shameful for the country and which, in the final analysis, comprised stealing from ourselves. The institution of citizenship deprivation, it seems to us, should be reexamined and repealed. We must not decide the fate of a specific, real human being according to the political situation of the moment, on the basis of entirely vague criteria using excessively imprecise standards (as in Article 26 of the draft—for "actions which bring discredit upon the high

calling of citizen of the USSR or Latvian SSR and which damage the prestige of the USSR or Latvian SSR"). Yes, a citizen is answerable to the Motherland, but a state bears complete responsibility for its citizens. Citizenship is a two-way relationship. Simply the desire of one organ of authority to terminate it is not enough. An equilibrium must be achieved between the might of a democratic state and the **will** of its citizen.

In any case, forced deprivation of citizenship occurs by right of the more powerful (a favorite principle of feudalism). In this sense, deprivation of citizenship is not even an action of yesterday, but of the day before. Termination of citizenship can be only voluntary (in the name of observing the democratic principle of equal rights and partnership between state and citizen).

The ingenuous "You can have it—it's no good to me" can be traced through other articles of the draft as well—Article 23, for example. Here the legal author suddenly falls into Puritanism and adds to the list of grounds for refusal of citizenship the **illnesses** of drug addiction and chronic alcoholism. If we follow the letter of the draft law we see that it is not an incapacity we are talking about, established in a certain procedure by law, but rather the presence in an individual of disease. There is also mention of the occupations of prostitution and vagrancy. In these cases, however, illegality of permanent source of livelihood (point 4, part 1, Article 22) or conviction in accordance with applicable articles (point 1, part 1, Article 23) already preclude the granting of citizenship.

An oversimplified, administrative solution to a problem always contains great opportunities for arbitrariness. A criminal life style is proven only by a court. Otherwise the notorious "101st kilometer" comes up.

Judging from published articles, lawyers today are rethinking the extremely vague concept of vagrancy. In criminal law, we are talking about common criminal activity, without a doubt. In the police aspect, vagrancy is a synonym for showing lack of class, being personally degenerate. However, if we abstract ourselves out from under the wardship of our police, the "inclination to shift locations" is widely treated in international legal documents as an inalienable right of man, objections against which indicate those same undemocratic concessions to the past. Our society has recently come to know full well how social conditions can create restless wanderers out of non-law-abiding (often not of their own volition), ordinary people. If we continue the logic of these legislative initiatives we risk obtaining a still greater number of "superfluous people," vagabonds.

Again we should stress—it is only by decision of a court that someone's way of life can be labeled criminal and serve as an obstacle in granting citizenship. Otherwise, a direct contradiction arises with the general democratic presumption of innocence. We understand why (as this is stipulated in all-union legislation) there is difficulty **removing** citizenship from a person under investigation, prior to an actual decision being rendered in his case (an individual bears the full burden of responsibility before the state). But **disapproval** of citizenship based on just one instance of **being brought** to trial (and not the fact of conviction) appears illogical. It would not be difficult to imagine a situation where criminal proceedings are brought against an individual aspiring to citizenship "with the prospect" of creating exactly such an obstacle.

The list of motives for denying citizenship in the noncriminal context—stirring ethnic or racial enmity and dissension, spreading ideas of fascism, chauvinism, or Stalinism—presents the broadest opportunities for arbitrary and biased interpretation. Point 2 of Article 23—on participation in illegal repressions during the German-Fascist occupation or during the Stalin cult of personality—is also illegal if detached from a judicial verdict. In addition, the very wording "illegal (during the period when the 'new order' of fascist Germany reigned in occupied territory) repression" is at the very least ambiguous. A definition of "bandit gangs" is lacking. Where, in what normative act, does it distinctly appear? Yet great significance is attributed to it.

In our view, three circumstances would suffice for this article (incapacity of an individual seeking citizenship, conviction for crimes against humanity, and the person's possession of foreign citizenship), so that the basis for acceptance or denial of citizenship did not contradict human rights.

We have already touched upon certain antidemocratic provisions in Article 22 ("Conditions for Granting Latvian SSR Citizenship"). Here we should also note the beginning of point 2, part 2, where discussion centers around **prominent** figures in the sphere of politics, culture, art, or science, **of world or all-union prestige**. Would it not be better to refrain from raising prestige to a principle—after all, Lysenko had all-union prestige, and in the sphere of politics...who has not? Let the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the republic make an independent decision in each case based on the general democratic (and, of course, without residency requirements) principles of the entire law. We are not talking about honorary citizenship, but citizenship in its daily application...

If we are to be consistent democrats, then Article 22 should be limited by the obligation of a future citizen to observe the Constitution and laws of the Latvian SSR, and the requirement that his permanent source of livelihood be legal. All the rest contains elements of moral constraint and intrudes into the sphere of human freedoms and rights. Language ability was not even required as a condition of citizenship in bourgeois Latvia.

There is still one more curious element to touch on—the loyalty oath. In signing this, the future citizen declares, as stipulated in the draft law, that he **is a patriot** of the republic, and obligates himself to work toward strengthening its sovereignty, etc. It turns out, according to the authors' logic, that not every patriot is a citizen, but

every citizen is a patriot.... What is involved in the concept "patriot of Latvia"? A moral-ethical or political interpretation? The latter, it would appear, for the text then goes on to deal with strengthening sovereignty. But what if someone sees benefit, according to his outlook, in Latvia joining some federation of European states, for example, or the merging of the three Baltic republics into a united Baltic entity, and wishes at the same time to religiously observe the laws of the Latvian SSR and the good of its economy? Would such thoughts be considered unpatriotic?

The requirement "to tie one's future in with it forever" is something out of the long-ago past, from the feudal concept of dependence on the fortress. The wording of the proposed declaration is somewhat mindful of signing a police statement on not leaving an area.

In our view, all a future citizen should be required to testify to in his declaration is a readiness to observe the laws of the state.

We could also discuss the internal inconsistencies of the draft and the illogical aspects of a number of articles (for example, the pretentious "endowment" of **equal**—minus certain specifically stipulated "exceptions"—abstract "rights and obligations" of citizens of the Latvian SSR and citizens of other union republics), the confusion in the definition of citizenship for children (too rigid in a number of instances, not taking parents' views into account), and the inconsistency regarding federation (ranging from disparaging the role of federative laws to **intrusion** of one form or another **into the competence** of union legislation). We will not even mention less fundamental faults, but will simply state certain conclusions.

The draft Law on Latvian SSR Citizenship presented for discussion:

1) directly or indirectly contradicts provisions of international law declaring human rights and freedoms, freedom to hold beliefs, freedom to choose one's language, freedom of relocation;

2) proceeds from the principle of priority of the indigenous nation over the rights of the population of the republic and the rights of man, subordinating to this principle a great portion of the norms stated in the draft;

3) programs collisions with federative legislation; there is intrusion, on the one hand, into the competence of the USSR and, on the other, there is disregard for union legislation in a number of cases;

4) contains a number of provisions which are distinguished by pretentiousness, the judgmental nature of criteria, and ambiguity in concept and wording which allow them to be interpreted arbitrarily;

5) contains articles allowing us to suppose that citizens of foreign states are afforded greater advantages than citizens of the USSR who are not Latvian citizens;

6) contains certain norms which are essentially concessions to the past, mindful of Stalinist formulas which subject themselves here to condemnation.

On the basis of analyzing the future Law on Latvian SSR Citizenship, we reach the conclusion that this draft, in its present form, is hardly capable of comprising a "matter of honor and dignity of a citizen of the Latvian SSR."

On behalf of the Council of the Center for Democratic Initiative,

[Signed] L. Pshennikova, legal expert; K. Matveyev, legal expert; O. Vovk, economist.

Estonia's Vyalyas on Independence, Gorbachev

LD1412102789 Tallinn International Service in English 2130 GMT 12 Dec 89

[From the "Estonia Today" program]

[Text] On Thursday [7 December] the Central Committee of the Estonian Communist Party held its full assembly. The first secretary of the Central Committee, Vayno Vyalyas, delivered a report on the political situation in the republic. He analyzed different movements that have set Estonian independence as an ultimate goal.

The Movement of the Estonian Citizens' Committees, for example, is of the opinion that only those citizens of the former Estonian republic and their descendents can take part in deciding the future of Estonia. Let's remind you here that the independent Estonian republic existed between the two world wars, from 1918 to 1940, when it was occupied by the Soviet Union. Now the Citizens' Committee have decided to organize the Estonian congress on 24 February 1990. The Estonian Labor Union, uniting the majority of the Estonian-speaking enterprises, wants to reach Estonian independence through an all-Estonian assembly, where there would be represented all the deputies that were elected yesterday at the local elections.

The Estonian Popular Front and the Estonian Democratic Union are forwarding the idea of a referendum in order to learn the mind of (?the people as to an independent state).

The Estonian party leader, Vayno Vyalyas, was of the opinion that the wish of every nation to live in conditions of an independent statehood is so unquestionable aned elementary that there is no need to organize congresses or opinion polls to learn about it. But according to him the interests of all the nationalities living in Estonia have not been taken into account. In addition, such a development would most likely to result in our losing of Estonia's potential allies outside the republic, plus the sharpening of inter-ethnic (?conflictions) in Estonia. [sentence as heard] As a result, it would threaten the whole course of perestroyka started by Mikhail Gorbachev. The outside world, as well as our offspring, would not forgive us for it because such a development could lead to the total loss of hope for independence and

to the maximum decline. Our path must be the path of providing active support for the foreign and domestic policy of Mikhail Gorbachev, Vyalyas. It should be a path of gradual widening of our independence, as well as our economic autonomy. It must be a path of gaining new allies. Such a path would lead to the basic change of the whole situation in the world and would guarantee independence and security for Estonia. It would lead to a new union where it would be possible to realise the idea of independence or from which we could secede in case we expressed a wish for it. That's the policy of the Estonian Communist Party (?and of a party the Estonians can trust), stressed Vyalyas, the Estonian party leader.

Estonia To Introduce Purchase Cards

LD1412143989 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1800 GMT 13 Dec 89

[Summary] Today the Estonian SSR Council of Ministers Presidium made a decision to introduce republican purchase cards from February. The details will be sent to local soviets for proposals and comments. Ants Laos, minister of trade, says that the idea is that this card will be an effective measure in protecting the domestic market and the printing of it will defy fakes. The present system of checking customers' passports is cumbersome and not always observed.

Ants Laos suggested that the quantities of goods which Estonian enterprises sell outside the republic should be controlled, so that there are goods on the domestic market to protect.

Starting from 1 January, a number of goods will be allocated through workplaces which allows for fairer distribution.

Estonian Election Results Viewed

90UN0488A Moscow TRUD in Russian 12 Dec 89 p 3

[Article by TRUD correspondent L. Vaino: "Boycott Against One's Own?"]

[Text] Elections to the local government bodies were held in Estonia on 10 December. The law allows 5 days for final returns; however, some common features of the elections are already obvious. The first and the main one is that the boycott of the elections which the leaders of Intermovement had called for did not materialize. The necessary 50% of the votes were cast at almost all of the polling stations. It is only in Tallinn that four out of three dozen stations will have to conduct the elections again.

It goes without saying that we will not have the 99.9% that we have become accustomed to in previous years, but the terms of the present elections cannot compare with those of the past. There were 9,182 candidates for 4,209 of the mandates. The struggle was enhanced not only by the variety of platforms, but also by the discord between certain political intriguers who in reality used the campaign just as a pretext. Now, that the elections are behind us, it became clear that all the efforts of these people were aimed to weaken the position of the non-Estonian part of the population at the first, closest to people, stage of the Soviet power. Many Russian-speaking candidates withdrew their nominations and those who did not obey were subjected to persecution, and oral and written insults.

I do not know yet whether Mikhail Vanin, a candidate from the "center", was elected but I voted for him. The platform of the six non-Estonian independent candidates avoides any extremes; they call for tolerance, good-neighbor relations, and for a civilized attitude in politics; they offer a constructive economic program for Tallinn. The leaders of Intermovement could respond to this platform by only rude interference during the meetings with the constituency.

Not knowing the official results, I can not draw any conclusions but I would imagine that the biggest number of the mandates in the capital of Estonia will be given to the Tallinn Electoral Union. Unfortunately this organization, which presents a bloc of several movements, including some extreme ones, used methods that cannot be qualified as irreproachable. For instance, every candidate from the union signed a statement that he was ready to withdraw from the campaign for mutual benefit. Such actions create a foundation for wheeling and dealing and also hurt the interests of voters who liked the program of the "forced" candidate.

In this way, all the extremes put together damaged real democracy. The combined efforts of Intermovement and the Electoral Union resulted in the absence of a proportionate representation of the city's nationalities in the Tallinn City Council. To be honest though, we should mention here that the councils of major cities in the northeast of Estonia will have as members mainly the representatives of the Russian-speaking part of the population.

Estonian Work Collectives Union Registered

LD1412104189 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1800 GMT 12 Dec 89

[Summary] Today, the Estonian Socialist Soviet Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium reregistered the Estonian Union of Work Collectives which, since its previous registation, has held a congress and adopted another constitution. The new registration means that the union is now registered as a sociopolitical organization.

New Ukraine First Deputy Premier Appointed

LD1512142689 Kiev Domestic Service in Ukrainian 1845 GMT 14 Dec 89

[Text] The Ukraine Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium has released Comrade

Kachalovskiy from the post of first deputy chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers in connection with his retirement on pension.

The Presidium has appointed Comrade Anatoliy Sergeyevich Statinov as first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Ukrainian SSR, having released him from the post of minister of trade of the Ukrainian SSR.

Ukraine Perestroyka Group Joins Democratic Bloc

LD1412200689 Kiev Domestic Service in Ukrainian 2200 GMT 13 Dec 89

[Text] A pre-election campaign has commenced in the Ukraine. Labor collectives and public organizations are both participating. In particular Rukh [Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka] and several informal organizations have united into a Democratic Bloc which has released its own election manifesto. I asked Dmytro Pavlychko, chairman of the T. Shevchenko Ukrainian Language Society, one of the bloc's founders, to enlighten us on this novelty.

[Begin Pavlychko recording] Our aim is simple—to elect to soviets people who display independence, nonconformist thinking, an aptitude for restructuring, and who enjoy popularity among our people. We link all our hopes of a rule-of-law state and democratic society with the forthcoming elections and with the future soviets. Our program defines actions for restructuring in the Ukraine; it is the Rukh's program in an abridged version. Now we have adherents of Rukh in higher echelons of our party leadership. We will support those party members and state figures who have shown themselves as men of restructuring. And I expect that the Rukh will get support from the ranks of the party. [end recording]

Ukraine Students Confederation Formed

LD1412103589 Kiev in Ukrainian to Europe 1800 GMT 11 Dec 89

[Text] A constituent congress of representatives of the republic's universities has been held in Kiev. Its participants discussed future plans for the students of Ukraine. Our correspondent, Dmytro Palamarchuk, reports:

It was stated that the aim of the congress is to create a students' union of Ukraine which, according to the declaration, should be an independent public organization defending the causes and interests of students. Apart from this union, the congress founded a Confederation of Students of Ukraine, which encompases both the union, the students brotherhood from Lvov, the student association "Wave" [Khvylya], from Odessa, the "Left Front" [Livyy Front], from Dnepropetrovsk, and also several student branches of Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka [RUKH] which function in higher educational establishments.

Moldavia Floats Loan To Cover Budget Deficit

LD1512100189 Moscow TASS in English 0917 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] Kishinev December 15 TASS—Moldavia, a south western republic of the USSR, has floated its first independent internal loan. It is intended to cover the 130-million roubles budget deficit of the 1990 economic plan. The loan was floated for a period of 16 years. It will be distributed among enterprises, organisations and cooperatives. The share holders are guaranteed an annual interest of 5 per cent.

"The loan will bring the government the money it needs to fulfil the urgent tasks set by the Moldavian Supreme Soviet," Andrian Budyanu, the republic's finance minister, told TASS. Next year's budget envisages much larger allocations for social programmes. Spending on ecology will grow by 25 per cent, education—41 per cent, public health and aid to low-income groups—60 per cent. [no closing quote as received]

According to the finance minister, faster growth of spendings on social needs in recent years is accompanied in Moldavia by [?growing difficulties] in money circulation. In addition to the long-term loan, the government is planning to take several other measures next year to surmount them. It is envisaged for the first time to close down several permanently unprofitable enterprises. The budget will stand to gain not only from the discontinuation of subsidies, but from the additional funds received from the sale of the property of these enterprises to other owners, including cooperatives and the population.

Budyanu believes that these and other measures will not only help to overcome the republic's budget deficit, but will have a positive effect on the financial situation in all the branches of Moldavian economy in the period of their transition to complete cost-accounting and self-financing.

Proceedings of Belorussian Party Plenum Detailed

90UN0256A Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA in Russian 19 Oct 89 p 1

[Text] The 15th Plenum of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee was held on 18 October in Minsk. The plenum examined the question of convening the 31st Belorussian Communist Party Congress. A report on this matter was delivered by Ye.Ye. Sokolov, first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee.

The following spoke in the debate: A.A. Zelenovskiy, first secretary of the Brest Obkom [oblast committee] of the Belorussian Communist Party; M.V. Zhebrak, first secretary of the Volkovyssk Gorkom [city committee] of the Belorussian Communist Party; V.V. Pantalev, first secretary of the Novopolotsk Gorkom of the Belorussian Communist Party; V.N. Chachin, rector of the Belorussian Polytechnical Institute; L.S. Shulzhenko, machine

operator of the Gomel Car Repair Plant named after M.I. Kalinin; V.I. Zheleznyak, chairman of Gomelskiy Rayon's Lenin Kolkhoz, and hero of socialist labor; A.T. Kuzmin, personal pensioner and member of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee; and D.K. Artsimenya, chairman of the oblispolkom [oblast executive committee] of Grodno Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies.

The plenum passed a resolution on the matter discussed, which is published in the press.

The plenum also examined organizational matters. In connection with his election as chairman of the Supreme Soviet Presidium of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, N.I. Dementey was released as secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee. A.S. Kamay, who had previously been first secretary of the Gomel Obkom, was elected secretary and member of the Bureau of the Central Committee of the Belorussian Communist Party.

In connection with G.S. Tarazevich's election as chairman of the Nationality Policy and Interethnic Relations Commission of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, he was released as member of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau.

In connection with the confirmation of S.Ye. Pavlov as rector of the Minsk Higher Party School, he was released as head of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee's Ideology Department. A.V. Rusetskiy was confirmed as head of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee's Ideology Department.

Armenia Sending Supplies to NKAO by Air

NC1312123589 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1300 GMT 12 Dec 89

[Text] The Goris airport collective is engaged in intense work. Various foodstuffs and vital goods are brought here on trucks from the different regions of the republic every day so as to send them the to Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] by air, the only way to get them there. The helicopters make three to four flights each day to Stepanakert, Martagert, Hadrut, and (Dolalar), even under unfavorable weather conditions and carrying passengers and freight.

However, both the airport and the pilots have some problems. The most important is the question of fuel, because the airport lacks a basic fueling facility and the fuel is brought from Yerevan by one single truck. The airport must have its own fuel reserve. The fuel transported by the truck is insufficient. If Goris airport had one more helicopter, it would be possible to transport 25 tonnes of freight to NKAO every day.

Railroad Official on Armenia Blockade Aftermath

PM1412164889 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 2

[Interview with I. Melkadze, first deputy chief of the Transcaucasus Railroad, by correspondent F. Ivanov in Tbilisi, under the rubric "Details for IZVESTIYA": "The Blockade Has Ended—Let Us Count the Losses"—date of interview not stated; first two paragraphs are IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] Tbilisi—The other day the Azerbaijan Railroad leadership announced the resumption of train traffic to Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh. The many months of blockade of the republic and the autonomous oblast have ended, but the consequences continue to affect the pace of railroad shipments.

I. Melkadze, first deputy chief of the Transcaucasus Railroad, talks to IZVESTIYA correspondent F. Ivanov about how to eliminate losses and restore normal traffic schedules.

[Melkadze] During the blockade we had to sacrifice freight destined for Georgia itself and leave it at intermediate stations and in sidings. Now some 60 such "abandoned" trains have accumulated on the sector from Sochi to Tbilisi, approximately 3,000 freightcars. All that could not fail to affect supplies in the republic. A strained situation with fuel has arisen in Georgia; in Tbilisi itself the waiting lines for gasoline extend for kilometers, and there have been interruptions to Aeroflot flights. Because of the fuel shortage, all flights from Tbilisi had to be canceled on 30 November. After a day, it proved possible to rectify the situation, but even now the planes have to refuel at Rostov or Krasnodar.

During the blockade the Transcaucasus Railroad lost R10 million because of freightcar idle time—a sum that cannot, of course, be made up by the end of the year. Who will suffer? Mainly the railmen themselves. In switching to economic accountability we planned to increase the volume of construction of housing, kindergartens, and hospitals by 100-150 percent. But with these losses, such plans are beyond us now. It is not a question of housing—the important thing is to clear the railroad and eliminate bottlenecks.

Situation in Armenian Border Village Reported

NC1512082389 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1300 GMT 13 Dec 89

[Excerpt] [Unidentified reporter] [Passage indistinct] The people of Kornidzor village in Gorisskiy Rayon are concerned over the difficult situation that has arisen in the region. The situation became more heated when two villagers were brutally killed by the Turkish mob. This was no ordinary killing; in its form and method it recalled the crimes committed in Sumgait, Shushi, Kirovabat, and (?Khochalu). This is confirmed by Spartak Agopyan, secretary of [words indistinct] party organization:

[Agopyan] Kornidzor village in Goris Rayon is situated along the Armenian border and (?on one) side is adjacent to villages in Azerbaijan. Since the start of the Artsakh [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, NKAO] movement, the residents of the Azeri villages began to show hostility to us. They caused heavy damage to our economy and terrorized the village's residents. Such activities intensified after an Azeri settlement was built facing our vineyards. They frequently fire upon the people working in the vineyards, thus provoking the Armenian population.

[Reporter] The entire course of the Artsakh movement [words indistinct]. The central leadership by playing the role of mediator for reconciliation is in fact further encouraging our neighbors' [word indistinct] anti-Armenian sentiments. The Goris-Lachin road linking Artsakh with NKAO is already closed and the only other road leading into Artsakh from Kornidzor has not escaped the attention of the Azeris. At the time of the earthquake, the Azeris built a settlement to close that road. With the establishment of this settlement, the security of the Armenians in the region has come under threat. The people of Kornidzor (?properly) comprehend this situation. Asked how they are organizing their self-defense, Spartak Agopyan replied:

[Agopyan] We called a number of meetings and explained in detail what we must do to guarantee the security of the population. We set up teams to guard the village and the surrounding area around the clock and are maintaining calm. We have taken the necessary measures for self-defense [words indistinct]. We have built a wall around the water tower to prevent any attempt to poison the water supply. The republic's militia teams, the troops of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry, and (?most of all) the activists of the Armenian national movement are actively helping to ensure security. [Words indistinct] the rayon and republican internal affairs leadership are concerned with the defense of our village. However, they are not taking sufficient measures and therefore all available resources are not being used in the defense of the village. [passage omitted]

World Support for Armenian Quake Victims

LD1212214189 Moscow TASS in English 1124 GMT 12 Dec 89

[Text] Yerevan December 12 TASS—Here is news from Soviet Armenia:

Condolences Pour in to Armenia From all Over the World

Telegrams and letters are pouring in from various countries to Armenia in connection with the anniversary of the devastating earthquake. They express confidence that the Armenian people will find the stamina and spiritual strength to rebuild ruined cities and villages with assistance from other nations.

British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher wrote that the British people are following the heroic efforts of the Armenian people with great interest.

She expressed hope of observing the reconstruction work in Armenia herself, since she plans to visit the republic in June to inaugurate a school in Leninakan, which is being built as a joint effort.

The courage displayed by the Armenian people during this time of trials is an example for Britons, she continued. Thatcher expressed good wishes to Armenia on the anniversary of the tragic event.

Liturgy in Commemoration of Quake Victims

Thousands of people came for a liturgy at the Holy Virgin church in Leninakan. It was conducted by Vazgen I, the catholicos of all Armenians, who prayed for peace of soul for last year's numerous quake victims.

On the same day the head of the Armenian Apostolic Church consecrated a monument put up in Leninakan in commemoration of the quake victims.

Italians Donate a Kindergarten House

The Italian firm Daniel built and donated a well-appointed kindergarten-nursery for 120 children of workers employed by the Autogenous engineering factory in Kirovakan. In addition to bed-rooms, dining-rooms and play-rooms, the complex includes a concert hall and sports facilities.

Many foreign firms participating in restoration work have built children's establishments in the earthquake zone, including enterprises from Czechoslovakia, the Netherlands, Bulgaria and Switzerland.

The Collection "Saga About Bread"

Yerevan prose writer and researcher Gaik Khachatryan compiled the book "Saga About Bread", which includes Armenian legends about bread, as well as tales and parables. It was published by the publishing house Aiastan [Armenia].

Along with written sources, the book incorporates numerous folkloric tales collected by the compiler. They describe methods of bread-baking as well as bakeries from the days of yore to our times.

One of the chapters deals with the first public bakery in Armenia which operated in the 3rd century B.C. in the capital city of Arshamashat. It was the world's only bakery employing its own herald, a folk singer, who went into streets in the morning, singing songs about the bakery's bread baked.

Armenia Society Set Up in Georgia

The aim of the Armenian cultural and charity society set up in Tbilisi , capital of neighbouring Georgia, is to promote the development of Georgian-Armenian relations.

Over 470,000 Armenians live in Georgia. There are 170 schools in the republic teaching in the Armenian language. Georgia also publishes newspaper, books and airs radio broadcasts in Armenian. The Tbilisi Teachers' Training Institute has a section preparing Armenian language teachers.

The Armenian drama theatre operating in Tbilisi enjoys great popularity. It recently celebrated its centenary.

Georgian Party Removes South Osetia Obkom Chief

WA1212202589 Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 14 Nov 89 p 1

[Text] A meeting of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau which examined the question of the situation that has taken shape recently in the South Osetian Autonomous Oblast was held on 12 November.

The resolution that was passed observes that a tense social and political situation fraught with serious negative consequences has come about recently in the South Osetian Autonomous Oblast. The majority of industrial enterprises have not worked for 6 weeks, and unsanctioned demonstrations, sitdown demonstrations, and other protest actions of a political nature have been staged in Tskhinvali constantly.

Demands for the resignation of the leadership of the autonomous oblast and changes in its status, for Osetian to be declared the official language, for a visit by a USSR Supreme Soviet commission and such have been among the main demands. For the purpose of satisfaction of their unwarranted claims the organizers of the unsanctioned, illegitimate actions have resorted to methods of pressure on the leadership of the oblast and have hampered, by blockading buildings, the normal functioning of its executive authorities. Attempts have been made to influence members of the obkom [oblast party committee] and deputies of the oblast soviet for the purpose of holding a plenum and session without prior arrangement for the adoption of the appropriate decisions.

In spite of the decision of the oblast soviet ispolkom [executive committee] on postponement of the session, some deputies of the oblast soviet and representatives of informal and other organizations gathered in Tskhinvali on 10 September and unlawfully demanded a decision on the matter of the oblast's official language and requested that the Georgian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet examine the question of the conversion of the autonomous oblast into an autonomous republic.

The resolution emphasizes that the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, disturbed by the development of events and the consistent spurring of tension, has adopted specific, multifaceted measures to normalize the situation. Members of the Central Committee Bureau and executives of republic authorities have travelled to the autonomous oblast repeatedly and given exhaustive answers to the questions which have been put.

The situation in South Osetia has been studied repeatedly in the Central Committee Bureau, with the invitation of the entire obkom bureau, oblispolkom [oblast soviet executive committee] and party and soviet leaders of regions of the autonomous oblast included. It has been explained to them, as well as the representatives of the public movements, strike committees and the work force, that the republic leadership has an understanding attitude toward the problems which exist in the oblast and is doing everything for their examination on legitimate grounds and in a normal atmosphere precluding lack of objectivity and injustice.

There are no grounds for the creation of so tense a social and political situation in South Osetia, which is profitable only to certain circles endeavoring to destabilize the situation in the region and in areas of Upper Kartli and, via this, in Tbilisi also, and engender conditions for possible confrontation and clashes on an interethnic basis. The available bitter experience in this respect points to the need for the timely curtailment of the reckless hankerings and attempts.

Under the current conditions the South Osetian Obkom and Oblispolkom have not always acted firmly and consistently, have not employed all the necessary resources and levers for influencing people and their frame of mind, have been unable to mobilize the party activists, the deputies, and the communists for active explanatory work and healthy, constructive dialogue with various public strata, and have failed to display due decisiveness, adherence to principle, and militancy.

The Georgian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau satisfied A.G. Chekhoyev's request that he be relieved of his duties of first secretary of the South Osetian Obkom.

In connection with the current situation in the South Osetian Autonomous Oblast, leadership of the obkom bureau was entrusted to M.A. Gokhelashvili. He was given responsibility for ensuring the due political focus and firmness in realization of the decisions adopted by the Central Committee Bureau pertaining to stabilization of the situation and a stimulation of the activity of the party organizations in this area.

The Georgian Communist Party Central Committee charged M.A. Gokhelashvili and A.A. Kachmazov, chairman of the oblispolkom, with adopting exhaustive measures for bringing order to bear, and observance of the standards of party, state, and labor discipline and socialist laws by each communist, working person, and inhabitant of the oblast and an increase in the authority and political and organizing influence of the obkom and oblispolkom.

It was proposed that the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee Party Control Committee study in conjunction with the obkom party control committee questions connected with the irresponsible actions of certain communists of the oblast who have contributed to the exacerbation of the social and political situation.

Information was noted and the appropriate instructions were given to the leaders of the law enforcement authorities of the republic and the autonomous oblast on the time frame for examination of the questions of the liability of the organizers of and participants in the unlawful actions staged in South Osetia and on the ensuring of due public order, citizens' safety and the use to this end of all legitimate resources and opportunities.

On 13 November Comrades G.G. Gumbaridze and N.A. Chitanava visited Tskhinvali, where they had a meeting with members of the South Osetian Obkom Bureau and the oblispolkom leadership. The participants in the meeting were familiarized with the decision of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau, which determined the priority tasks of the party and soviet authorities pertaining to a normalization of the social and political situation in the autonomous republic and a stimulation of the activity of the party organizations in this area.

On behalf of the party and soviet leaders of the oblast M.A. Gokhelashvili assured the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee and the republic government that all necessary measures would be implemented to stabilize the situation, bring due order and organization to bear and extend the restructuring processes in the interests of the consolidation of all public forces.

The results of the meeting were summed up by G.G. Gumbaridze, first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee.

The same day Comrades G.G. Gumbaridze and N.A. Chitanava visited Gori, and Goriyskiy, Kaspskiy and Mtskhetskiy rayons, where they met and had discussions with the leaders of the party and soviet authorities of the city and the rayons.

Early Nov Unrest in South Osetia Viewed

90US0250A Tbilisi MOLODEZH GRUZII in Russian 16 Nov 89 pp 1,3

[Article by special correspondent of MOLODEZH GRUZII B. Urigashvili, datelined Tskhinvali-Tbilisi: "We Write One Down, Carry Two, or Once Again About the Political Trends, the Issue of 'Where Are We Headed,' and the Skill of Seeing Real Life"]

[Text] I am not going to fatigue the reader by a detailed rendition of what has happened in Tskhinvali and the autonomous oblast in the last month and a half. I will only say briefly that strikes paralyzed virtually all industrial enterprises of the city and the oblast. Quite recently the extreme actions of civil protest, hunger strikes, began. They were held directly in an area adjacent to the oblast party committee and the oblast executive committee.

Everything culminated in the events that occurred on 9 and 10 November. The building of the party committee of the oblast was blocked. Participants in the meeting demanded that the first secretary of the oblast committee of the party and the chairman of the oblast executive committee resign and that a session of the oblast soviet of people's deputies be convened. On 9 November a plenum of the oblast party committee was held which accepted the resignation of First Secretary A. Chekhoyev. On 10 November, late in the evening, a session was held which was referred to as extraordinary. Citizens of the republic have been informed about the resolutions adopted by the session of the oblast soviet. On 11 November strike actions in the autonomous oblast were discontinued.

Now a few words on Tskhinvali as we saw it during the day of 12 November. It was quiet in the city; there were no military roadblocks of any kind. There was no special tension, contrary to what the rumors in Tbilisi persistently maintained. That is, I want to say absolutely unambiguously that the situation was absolutely not of the same order as the one in Abkhazia in the ill-fated days of July and later. This is why I do not understand the mechanism of the emergence of completely improbable rumors about the oblast being almost like Lebanon and a civil war being on. I would allow for someone, perhaps, wanting to rally the people in this manner "for new victories," around yet another simple and understandable idea or against the image of a new enemy. I am absolutely not inclined to attribute the emergence of these rumors to "the creativity of the people." They are too purposeful for that. It goes without saying that using such Jesuit methods to achieve one's political ends is not a noble endeavor at all.

In a word, the rumors are incredibly exaggerated. This once again disturbs the consciousness of the people, bringing out the feeling of uncertainty in some and the desire to act immediately in others. Taken together, all of these are elements of a confrontation on ethnic grounds rather than anything else.

Meanwhile, according to the information we have received from the most varied sources, there has not been a single clash or skirmish on ethnic grounds since 26 May.

In Tskhinvali, I met and talked with a representative of the procuracy, the first secretary of the Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] oblast committee, students of the teacher's institute, representatives of "Adamon Nykhas" [People's Conversation], and the regional chapter of the People's Front of Georgia.

It became clear in the course of my conversations that the confrontation still exists, as well as the reluctance to

take reality into account, completely justified and completely unjustified rebukes, miscalculations, and mistakes as a result of which the mass proudly referred to as the people makes its own elected representatives assume populist positions.

Everyone unanimously named the mass media one of the main culprits in the current tension in the oblast. They said that articles in the republic newspapers caused the feeling of uncertainty and fear for their future among the people. This was supplemented by what was said at the meetings organized by some members of informal organizations at which, in the opinion of "Adamon Nykhas," insults were hurled at the Osetians and their ethnic dignity was humiliated.

In this instance, the opinion of First Secretary of the South Osetian Oblast Komsomol Committee Ibragim Dzhioyev is particularly interesting.

He said: "Unfortunately, we receive the printed word as the ultimate truth. Any article in any newspaper is received as the official position of the authorities. The people absolutely do not take into account the fact that this may be the point of view or the position of the specific person whose signature is under the article, rather than the official one or even that of the editorial office. The people are not to blame for such categorical judgments. This is what years of the absence of elementary glasnost of any kind and pluralism of opinions have done to us. Certainly, the journalists and editorial offices have to overcome this stereotype of the readers. However, we cannot disregard this attitude toward the printed word either. Occasionally, given the absence of elementary political culture under our conditions, the printed word may become the Bickford fuse leading to a powder keg."

It is not often that I agree with the opinion of Komsomol functionaries. However, it is difficult to object in this instance. The way from "unanimous approval" to glasnost is easier than that from glasnost to the freedom of speech. The freedom of speech calls for other political structures; it does not accept the ones we have.

It is exactly the political structures that we talked about with representatives of "Adamon Nykhas"—People's Front of South Osetia. This is understandable. The demand for the status of an autonomous republic which was sort of legalized at the extraordinary session of the oblast executive committee prompted such conversations very much, all the more so because it was clear that this demand is the brainchild of "Adamon Nykhas."

It is difficult to believe that representatives of "Adamon Nykhas" did not know about the difficult situation not only in the oblast but in the entire republic. Certainly, they knew about it. The fact that deliberately unacceptable demands which create a stalemate were adopted on the eve of a session of the Georgian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet under some pressure (let us call a spade a spade), primarily from "Adamon Nykhas," makes me think that they are based either on populism or on the desire to aggravate the situation.

The argument that, given the current unstable situation, constitutional guarantees are needed in order to stabilize the situation is definitely serious. However, has the right way been opted for? Are these the structures which indeed provide some kind of guarantees? After all, we actually still live in a unitary state where even the notion of a union republic is largely fictitious. Any attempt to undermine unitarianism is given a hostile reception (recent legislative acts of the USSR Supreme Soviet show this). In this instance I absolutely agree with A. Chochiyev, who interjected during our conversation that the autonomous oblast and the autonomous republic are equally fictitious. Indeed, these administrative-state structures with their swollen bureaucratic apparatuses were not created in order to give freedom either to individuals or entire nations. It seems to me that their function is rather the opposite. Therefore, is it worthwhile to arouse the people in the name of a fiction, disturb the consciousness of people, and provide a fertile ground for a flare-up of ethnic psychosis?

Perhaps it may be reasonable to seek constitutional guarantees both for one's people and for every individual citizen through the new Constitution of Georgia, to participate as much as possible in the very creation of the law which will ensure personal, civil, and national freedom. When all of us talk about the parliamentary way and do nothing specific in this regard, all of this talk turns into a sort of magic incantation. We will secure no parliament, law-based state and political and economic sovereignty through incantations and mystical appeals for democracy, nor will we secure them by permanent interethnic tensions.

After all, we can argue endlessly about "the guests" and "the masters," "nationalism" and "internationalism," and lock horns on the pages of newspapers, and not only there. Don't all those who prefer this way here in Tbilisi, in Tskhinvali, in Sukhumi, and in any other point of the republic understand that this is absolutely destructive and devoid of any historical promise? Haven't the hotbeds of interethnic tension emerging almost everywhere in our republic prompted all of us to think hard? Let us leave the third force alone. Here in Tskhinvali it became particularly clear to me that it is not the only point. Something else is also.

Ideally, there should not be a sober-minded citizen of our republic, regardless of his nationality, who would come out against the concept of an independent and democratic Georgia. However, this does occur at present. We must face up to the truth. It seems to me that this is happening because the people are not entirely convinced that attaining this goal will be beneficial for them, that they will have a full guarantee of the absence of any discrimination. Real programs are needed in order to calm the people. Few people are involved at present in this serious endeavor. We should prove by our deeds that a democratic, harmonious, and independent

Georgia is indeed possible, rather than sit around and wait for "gratitude for hospitality."

Trial of Former Uzbek Party Head Opens in Moscow

LD1412165689 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 14 Dec 89

[Text] Open legal proceedings began today in the USSR Supreme Court on the case of Usman Khodzhayev, former first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan. He is accused of bribe-taking. The criminal cases' panel of judges of the USSR Supreme Court is sitting, with (Brizitskiy) presiding over the case, a member of the USSR Supreme Court, and people's assessors (Kuznetsov) and (Rozhepov) on its bench. (Baranov), senior assistant to the USSR procurator general, is chairman of the state prosecution. The defense of the accused is being carried out by (Rostovskiy), a member of the Moscow City panel of barristers.

Usman Khodzhayev denied the charges preferred against him.

The panel of judges has begun examining the accused.

Khodzhayev Trial Detailed

LD1412175189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 14 Dec 89

[Text] Open legal proceedings have begun today in the USSR Supreme Court on the case of Usman Khodzhayev, former first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan. He is accused of bribe-taking.

The statement of indictment says: Exploiting a position of responsibility for mercenary aims, between 1979-1983, Usman Khodzhayev received bribes on more than one occasion for protection and support in work, for assistance in resolving official [sluzhebniy] and other questions.

The defendant is accused of receiving R55,300 in bribes.

On the first day of the court hearing, the lawyer Rostovskiy submitted several petititions.

The panel of judges ruled that the lawyer's petitions are to be granted, partly because of the demands for a character reference and a certificate on the state of the defendant's health.

Witnesses have been called to deal with the complaint by Usman Khodzhayev's wife regarding the preliminary investigation bodies' illegal treatment of her and the statment by Usman Khodzhayev addressed to the USSR procurator general, in which he reported that during the investigation he was forced to slander himself and others.

In court, Usman Khodzhayev completely denied the charges preferred against him.

The panel of judges has begun examining the accused.

1,224 Deaths Reported in Bashkiria Pipeline Blast

LD1512054189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2230 GMT 14 Dec 89

[Summary] More than 6 months after the terrible tragedy on the Western Siberia-Urals-Volga region products pipeline in Bashkiria on the night of 3-4 June, the latest figures of the state commission say that 1,224 people died as a result of the blast and from severe burns in the hospital. Proposals for a monument to the victims are on display in Ufa.

RSFSR People's Front Program Criticized

PM0112101389 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 26 Nov 89 Second Edition p 3

[Letter from ex-serviceman A. Krasnov: "Impression of the 'Front' Program. I Will Not Join Such Saviors"]

[Text] Fronts and movements are in vogue today. Turn to your right and there's a front, turn to your left and there's another one, while people in the center are left grousing like "frondeurs." The calls of the "front members" are passionate and strenuous: Unite. Demand. Fight. Against whom? For what? Each front has its own adversaries and aims.

Walking through the Old Arbat, I decided to buy a fisherman's lure at the "Okhotnik" store. There were two young men there with badges on their jackets who were selling a program...for the price of R1.50 for two thin sheets of paper (how ideas have risen in price nowadays!). I asked: "What is it about?" "It's the Russian People's Front Program," was the reply.

I became interested. Young men, I thought, you are performing a fine service. Russia has to be saved. The motherland has to be helped. Otherwise in its wretched, enfeebled state it will quite fade away. Our environment is in a pretty bad way—the rivers are filthy. The small peoples grumble that civilization is oppressing them. The economy needs bucking up. For instance, the Nonchernozem Zone simply cannot make progress. There are shortages everywhere—there's no soap, maybe just enough to wash every other day. In short, there's a wide field of activity—fight away, and the best of luck.

I did not begrudge the R1.50 for the program with its "calls" and "instructions." I was about to sign the declaration. "I accept," "share," and "am ready to participate." Nevertheless, I decided to glance at the program out of curiosity.

"A switch to freedom of all information... including so-called 'anti-Soviet, anticommunist, and ideologically harmful information...'" A very radical demand! It indicates the great craving for "freedom" felt by the program's author. There was only one small hitch: He had not asked the workers, peasants, and working people in general whether they wanted such "freedom."

"Radical reform and curtailing of the Institution of Social Sciences—the enormous army of 'priests of the Marxist parish' (with and without academic qualifications), (my comma—A.K.) who have for decades poured out torrents of lies and demagoguery to the people and made a good living for themselves out of those lies and demagoguery." Well now! Indeed, if there is freedom for **anticommunism and anti-Sovietism,** we don't need the social sciences. The aforementioned "priests" would clearly be detrimental to this freedom. Let us break up the social sciences departments and hand the job of educating students to the various "democratic unions" and "fronts"... And then the future engineers, teachers, doctors, and so forth will go straight into the anticommunists' arms.

Or take the following: "Abandonment of the desire to live without fail differently from the way they do in civilized countries." What might this mean? Most likely the program's compiler thinks that there is not a whiff of civilization in our country.

True, it should be noted that the author does not make clear which countries he regards as civilized and which he excludes from that list. In short, many doubts arise here. It is unclear therefore which "civilization" we should aim for.

"An end to propaganda of the cult of the state, the cult of state power... A radical reduction and limitation of the sphere of competence of the state (or the bureaucracy, as the state and bureaucratism are **the same thing**." I emphasize this conclusion in amazement.

I read this demand and wondered whether the author of this postulate had been less than diligent in his social sciences studies or had been out of luck with his teachers. The state, dear program-writer, is **not** identical with bureaucratism! If, of course, you proceed from Marxist teaching on the state rather than a vulgar philistine concept. The state can be democratic (that is the kind we are striving to build) or contain greater or lesser elements of bureaucratization.

Of course, we still have quite a lot of bureaucratism in our country and the bureaucrats have not disappeared. The roots of this lie not in the state itself, but, if one may put it this way, in the un-ideal "socialistness" of the state in practical life. The state therefore has to be improved and underpinned by the best legal norms, and bureaucratism and bureaucrats have to be eradicated. But it should not be wrecked or undermined.

The attempt to wind up statehood is truly a desire "to live without fail differently from" others. For some reason, I do not see anyone on our planet on the point of consigning the state to the museum of antiquities. But we do see in the world arena such "unpleasant things" as state borders and customs posts, police forces and armies, navies and air forces, departments and ministries, state alliances and blocs. It is strange that the program's author does not notice this.

"An end to unchecked propaganda of war and violence".... Human reason, of course, refuses to accept this! But the question is which country is being referred to? Not the country which on the very first day of its creation proclaimed the historic Decree on Peace? Not the country which—to make a historical digression—has repeatedly proposed peacemaking acts to the world community (it would take more than one newpaper page to list them all)? Not the country which is now pursuing new political thinking, has embarked on unprecedented activity aimed at building confidence among the peoples, and is taking unilateral disarmament steps?

One only has to ask these questions to see that the author of this demand is, to put it mildly, barking up the wrong tree. (There is no need to remind people here, either, that war propaganda is legally proscribed in our country and punishable under the criminal law.)

"Abandon bans on any forms of ownership, including private ownership." Bravo, bravo! After hearing a lot from our "priests" and having read loads of "priestly" books, we had thought that private ownership was the source of inequality and exploitation. It now turns out that we were profoundly mistaken. And that includes our forebears who 72 years ago took the factories and plants away from the Ryabushinskiys, Putilovs, Demidovs, and others of their ilk. Let us give them back to them or their descendants, let us hand out the ZIL, Kamaz, and Atommash plants and so on and so forth to the capitalists and the landowners (and who else?).

"Authorization for the self-liquidation of collective farms [kolkhozes] and state farms [sovkhozes] as forms of brutal state exploitation and plundering of the peasantry."

Let us leave the "exploitation and plundering" (by whom?) to the author's conscience. Let us consult with those who know the kolkhozes at first hand. At the First Congress of People's Deputies, V.A. Starodubtsev, a farmer with a countrywide reputation, said in reply to the opponents of the kolkhozes: "You want to deal a final blow to the peasants and thereby put the people on semistarvation rations for many years."

The supreme organ of state power, which includes quite a few farming specialists, considers that kolkhozes and sovkhozes should be approached from quite the opposite direction: They should not be "self-liquidated," but their material and technical base should be strengthened, the forms of labor organization and production relations within the farms should be improved, the infrastructure of the countryside should be developed, a variety of forms of economic management—agrofirms, cooperatives, leasehold collectives, and peasant farms—should be developed alongside kolkhozes and sovkhozes, and conditions conducive to equal competition among them should be created.

There is yet another "original" demand: The "transformation of the CPSU into a social democratic party with corresponding changes in its program..."

The only problem is that the program writer is probably dimly aware or altogether unaware of the fact that our party did at one time bear just such a title and replaced it at V.I. Lenin's suggestion. It took a new title—"Communist"—for two reasons: Because of the evolution of social democracy during World War I and the fact that the title "Communist" more accurately reflects Bolshevism's ultimate strategic objective. Or have we already abandoned that objective (let us note, incidentally, that socialism is also the initial stage of communism)? If the program's author thinks that way, it certainly does not mean that "everybody thinks" that way.

I do not, of course, have anything against social democracy (although it is far from homogeneous). But, nevertheless, communist and social democratic parties have substantial ideological, theoretical, and organizational differences. The switch from one, "communist" qualitative state to another "social democratic" one may not please some people, and it does not suit me, a Communist of 45 years standing....

I would not be objective if I did not say that there are some glimmers of common sense in the program too. Alas, they are lost in a stew of verbiage in dubious taste.

After reading the program I no longer wanted to join the "front." It is no good for me. This "front" is scarcely going to save Russia. But it could befuddle some people's minds. Even if the program's theses were drawn up by the "deputy director for scientific work at the the All-Union Translation Center of the USSR Academy of Sciences and the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology, born 1949, Russian, member of the CPSU." (Information taken from the text of the program).

[Signed] A. Krasnov, who also did some time at the front (1941-1945)

Perestroyka Seen 'Renewing' Socialism

PM0712093389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Dec 89 Second Edition p 3

[Doctor of Philosophical Sciences E. Andreyev and Doctor of Philosophical Sciences B. Slavin article datelined Moscow and published under the rubric "Questions of Theory: Debating Platform": "We Must Work Things Out..."]

[Text] **The question of socialism is once more the focus of universal attention. It was no accident that it was central to M.S. Gorbachev's article "The Socialist Idea and Revolutionary Perestroyka," published by PRAVDA 26 November. This is confirmation of the truth that this question arises with renewed force at every sharp turning point in history. Thus it was at the dawn of the workers movement, during the socialist teaching's transition from utopia to science. Thus it was in the late 19th and early 20th Century, during the split of the Social Democratic movement. Thus it was immediately after October [1917], when socialism was becoming reality and was painfully casting off romantic illusions and war-communist plans and methods.**

V.I. Lenin's remark at the end of his life today sounds more topical than ever: "We have made socialism part of daily life, and this is where we must work things out. This is what constitutes the task of the present, this is what constitutes the task of our era."

These words were an answer to those who did not believe in the possibility of socialist revolution and the building of socialism in our country. These words are an answer to those who speak and write about our society and who yesterday swore allegiance to "developed socialism" but today are questioning the very existence of the socialist system and its creative potential.

Nowadays you can hear all sorts of things said from all sides: that socialism either no longer exists in our country or that it has still to come into being, that we live almost in serfdom and even slavery, that we have some sort of semifeudal society and at the same time state capitalism. Increasingly often, voices can be heard speaking out in favor of the bourgeois system.

But where are the arguments? There are not all that many of them. The starting point of such conclusions is a reaction to the coercion and violence to which people were subjected during the times of Stalinism and stagnation. But does socialism boil down to nothing more than that? Do the humanist meaning of Marx' teaching on the new society, the democratic practice of Leninism in the first years of Soviet power, and the selfless labor, dedication, and heroism of the people before, during, and after the war, during the period of "thaw," and during the 5 years of perestroyka not vanish given such an approach? Are we not doing violence to reality by identifying socialism with its deformations, and with Stalinism in particular?

We are convinced that even the harshest descriptions of Stalinism pale in comparison with the reality. We have yet to fully study and comprehend the entire depth of the tragedy of that period and the senselessness of the people's sacrifices. Stalinism and socialism are antipodes. This is why Stalinism proved unable to supplant and completely squeeze out of our life the socialist trends established by October. The deformations of socialism and socialism itself are by no means the same thing. By identifying them, are we not simply approaching from the opposite side the symbol of the faith of the inveterate Stalinists who perceive Stalinism almost as the ideal materialization of socialism and perestroyka as a deviation from the latter?

We think that the history of socialism is not a mechanical succession of different models, but a dialectically complex process of the interaction of opposites. It is the arena of struggle between the proletariat and antiproletarian forces, between Leninism and Stalinism, between

supporters and opponents of perestroyka. Socialism was not built thanks to the cults of leaders and repressions, but despite them.

It must not be forgotten that Lenin's supporters consciously struggled against Stalin's tyranny. It was they who voted against him at the 17th Party Congress and who wrote anti-Stalin slogans with their blood in jail. It was their heirs who prepared the de-Stalinization launched by the 20th and continued by the 27th CPSU Congresses. Perestroyka revives Lenin's perception of socialism, its humanist and democratic meaning.

"Yes, our past is ambiguous. It includes victories and defeats, discoveries and mistakes, the glorious and the tragic, revolutionary enthusiasm, heroic labor and victims, great hopes and disappointments," M.S. Gorbachev writes in his article.

What kind of socialism have we built, and at what stage of it are we now? Without claiming possession of the ultimate truth, let us answer briefly: Socialism in our country was built in its most elementary forms, of which V.I. Lenin spoke in the past. But it was built with profound deformations and deviations of a barracks-bureaucratic nature.

Strictly speaking, nothing totally unforeseen happened. It is well known that K. Marx warned of the possibility and danger of "crude barracks socialism," which was indeed embodied in Stalinism and led to stagnation.

Getting rid of the deformations of socialism and the revolutionary renewal of socialism—this is the essence of the transitional period at which we find ourselves, the essence of perestroyka. We are talking about a transition, on the one hand, from elementary forms of socialism to its more mature forms and, on the other hand, from deformed socialism to its qualitatively new look. To be more specific, this means a transition from state-bureaucratic to humane and democratic socialism, from socialism with an administrative edict system of management to socialism based on economic and legal methods, from socialism of an industrial type to socialism using the latest achievements of the scientific and technical revolution. The new look of socialism that is emerging in the course of perestroyka, while possessing a labor nature, is freed from leveling-freeloading relations and is becoming an open pluralist society where every person, group, or class has the right to participate in the exercise of power and to publicly [glasno] express opinions.

The aforesaid makes it possible to conclude: The socialist system is being renewed rather than disappearing thanks to perestroyka. At the same time, it is not created out of thin air. The socialist society's movement toward its new look is simultaneously a revival of Lenin's criteria and an implementation of contemporary criteria of socialist-ness.

Practice has shown the artificial and illusory nature of the approach to determining criteria of social progress whereby the real is supplanted by what ought to be and the ideals of socialism, losing touch with life, are set in opposition to it. This was, for example, typical of the methodology used in the *"Short Course on the History of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks),"* the code of widespread building of communism, and the concept of developed socialism. The invalidity of this methodology led some specialists to deny the need for determining criteria of socialist-ness in principle. We cannot agree with this. Such criteria exist, and the founders of scientific socialism devoted much attention to them. We cannot manage without them today. As the 19th Party Conference noted, what we need are not social utopias but precise guidelines and objective criteria of socialist-ness at all stages of changes, so that trends in social development are clearly perceptible and petty routine matters and window dressing do not swell out of all proportion, as often happened in the past.

So what objective trends operate as real guidelines for the policy of socialism's renewal?

Let us primarily single out the social change trends which are common to all civilization. One of the important characteristics of contemporary social progress is, first, its reorientation from the material to the human factor of development and the humanization of social relations. Second, the interaction of the three global contemporary revolutions—scientific and technical, social, and philosophical—in the conditions of an integral world. The last one of these three revolutions is manifested in the affirmation of the new political thinking.

Let us also note the specifically historical trends and criteria characterizing the socialist society's viability and development prospects. They all stem from socialism's nature as the living creativity of the people. Deformations of socialism occur whenever this essence is watered down and spontaneous activity by the masses disappears. The opposite is also true: The socialist system's creative potential grows whenever favorable conditions are created for the manifestation of people's abilities.

The establishment of real humanism is the most fundamental criterion of socialist-ness. V.I. Lenin repeatedly wrote and spoke of humanism as an essential feature of socialism. When formulating the ultimate goal of the workers movement, he perceived it in the full prosperity and the free and comprehensive development of all members of society. Virtually all his statements on questions of improving working people's material position, of education and upbringing, are imbued with this idea. Vladimir Ilich considered it an obvious fact that, after overcoming man's alienation from the process and results of labor, after the passage of many years, Communists would approach the implementation of this far-from-utopian ideal.

Humanism is not just an idea of early Marxism, as Western experts on Marx sometimes claim, but the very

essence of the scientific world outlook inherited by Marxism from the great humanists and educators of the past.

Despite the desire of contemporary "democrats" and "patriots" to attribute to Lenin the "doctrinal" causes of the deformations of socialism, the excesses of revolutionary extremists during the Civil War years, and the repressions of the personality cult years, V.I. Lenin was and will go down in history as a revolutionary humanist.

Even during the Civil War years Lenin did everything possible to implement the revolution's humanist potential. Vladimir Ilich was convinced that the feeling of vengefulness, even toward class enemies, was alien to proletarian revolutionaries.

The desire to hold Lenin responsible for the arbitrariness of Stalinism is a far-reaching plan to discredit not only Leninism, but also Marxism and the history, theory, and practice of socialism as a whole. Humanism, freedom, and collectivism are the interconnected attributes and values of socialism.

It is neither religious "conciliarism" nor sham collectiveness but true collectivism that makes man free. This not only is a moral imperative but also an objective advantage of the new system. It cannot be realized without implementing a breakthrough in the productivity and efficiency of social labor.

Historical progress is unimaginable without the highest labor productivity. It is necessary to utilize this Leninist criterion as a specific guideline in policy so as to catch up with advanced countries in reality and not just in words and to surpass them also economically. The following question arises in this context: Is this altogether possible? According to Lenin, it is not only possible but also necessary. Today this is guaranteed by our people's wisdom, talent, and industriousness and by the practice of the leading sectors of production.

It would be complacent to believe that we are capable of effecting a breakthrough in the sphere of scientific and technical progress and in enhancing labor productivity by relying only on our own efforts, without taking world achievements into account. Of course, this does not mean blindly copying or idealizing capitalism's "corners of paradise." Of course, the capitalist world today is different from what it was in the times of K. Marx and V.I. Lenin. It has proved more viable than was previously imagined. It is impossible to deny its scientific and technical achievements, the working people's gains in the social sphere, and the noticeable growth of what we call preconditions of socialism. All this is true. Nonetheless, this does not turn the bourgeois society into a socialist one, despite what many of our "theoreticians" think. The contradiction between labor and capital, which is organically inherent in capitalism, remains. Militarism, profits, crime, immorality, and lack of spirituality have not disappeared.

Yes, there are countries where much that is positive can be found, where there are lessons to be learned. From our viewpoint, however, any euphoria about these countries is just as likely to lead to extremes as the recent denigration of them. At the same time, historical experience has shown that absolutization of the class approach and disregard for universal human values also fail to lead to automatic implementation of the advantages and criteria of socialism.

We agree with those specialists who perceive the causes of the deteriorating situation in our society in the fact that we are, figuratively speaking, falling between two stools: We are abandoning the old, edict-based system of social organization of labor but have not yet arrived at a new self-regulating system. This highly uncertain situation devalues both the centralized, planning mechanisms and the market mechanisms of management. Hence our inability to regulate and monitor the ambiguous processes associated with the activity of cooperative members, lessees, and individuals.

Today we need an objective vision of the advantages and shortcomings of both state ownership and the diverse forms of nonstate ownership, of both centralized and market regulatory mechanisms. It is time to implement in practice the idea of equal partnership and competition between the economy's state and cooperative sectors in the consumer's interests.

Today we are being pushed toward admitting the absolute value of a free market. It is important, however, to perceive also its dual nature: On the one hand, it stimulates the development of production and curbs state monopoly but, on the other hand, it generates a desire to get away from public monitoring of the extent of labor and extent of consumption and promotes the intensification of social differentiation.

There is an objective contradiction between the laws of the market economy and the demands of social justice under socialism. It cannot be avoided when implementing economic and social policy. Those who overlook the merits of cooperatives, leasing, joint stock and mixed enterprises, and individual labor activity, and those who try to justify unearned incomes are equally wrong. Is this not the cause of our teetering from one extreme to the other: From total license to total prohibition, from reliance on naked enthusiasm to absolutization of market relations?

Everyone today agrees that the most important condition and guarantee of perestroyka is the people's active participation in it. Nor is there any argument regarding the fact that the causes of the emergence of negative phenomena in our society lie in people's lack of interest in work, their alienation from the solution of statewide affairs, and the ineffectiveness of material and moral incentives. Debates begin with the definition of the "basic link" in the activation of the human factor. Some perceive this link in the development of productive forces, and scientific and technical progress in particular.

Others see it in production relations and the radical change of ownership relations. Yet others are convinced that it is all a matter of political reform, in other words of transferring power to the people and instituting public monitoring of the management apparatus.

It is typical, however, that recently there have been serious symptoms of an emerging awareness in the public mind that, behind the diversity of new problems and the various causes of crisis phenomena under socialism, there stands the most deep-rooted and common foundation of its internal movement: the system of social organization of labor.

Indeed, is it possible to achieve real successes in perestroyka without paying paramount attention to the organization, conditions, and nature of labor in society? Can we live better while working worse and worse, giving more thought to sharing out the common pie than to baking it? Are our policy and ideology not built basically on distributive rather than on productive, labor relations?

We talk a lot about leveling, the ineffectiveness of the incentives system, the large proportion of manual labor, and our production's unreceptiveness to scientific and technical progress and new ideas. But we do almost nothing to fundamentally transform statewide policy in the sphere of labor relations. As before, we are literally suffocated by gross output indicators, obsolete official instructions, wage rates, salary scales, basic pay, and the like. This, in our opinion, is one of the key questions of perestroyka. How can it be successful unless every working person becomes a real subject of ownership, a master, unless we switch from remuneration of any work in general to remuneration of labor according to its end results?

Thus what we need most of all is a "labor dimension" of perestroyka, of the methods for socialism's renewal. We perceive this as the most correct avenue showing a way out of today's collisions.

Today it is no longer enough to call on people to work. They must know the reason why this must be done.

It is impossible not to see that the idea of removing the party from the political arena is being suggested to us today. At times this idea is also shared by people who are party members. Incredible as it may seem, these people blame the party itself for the ruthless criticism by the party of their own past and present mistakes.

The party's strength and prestige are directly proportional to the extent to which its policy reflects the people's interests. This is impossible to achieve without being in the thick of the masses and securing their support. These are the roots of the basic link in the party's renewal and its democratization. It must abandon the bureaucratic edict style of work and must "mingle with the people," be prepared for competitive struggle for the masses, and have its own ideological leaders, spokesmen, and skilled organizers. Today, more than ever before, it must show concern for strengthening its own social base, promptly attracting all supporters of perestroyka and struggling against conservative and extremist forces.

We do not share the view that the party lacks a concept of perestroyka. But it must not be imagined that this concept answers all questions. The situation demands, first, a fundamental review of the party program and rejection of its obsolete provisions. Second, clear and precise answers to topical questions of today concerning our past, present, and future. A new ideology is needed: a party ideology in line with the creative spirit of Marxism-Leninism and contemporary realities, an ideology which anticipates events, which guides and rallies people.

Rogachev on Conference on Socialism's Problems

LD0712224289 Moscow World Service in English 1810 GMT 7 Dec 89

[Text] A scientific conference on problems of socialism, regularities of its emergence and prospects of its development have been held in Moscow. Yuriy Rogachev provides us with this account:

Leading Soviet political scientists, sociologists and economics experts took part in its discussions. They set out the task to examine socialism not as a theoretical idea, but as the existing social and economic system. The leading themes of the discussion were: Can society built in this country be called a socialist society? And: What society we'd like to get in the course of perestroyka. Most of the speakers were unanimous in declaring that the society built in this country had turned out to be a far cry from true socialism. In Stalin's time socialism was deformed beyond recognitioin both in theory and in practice. In a bid to strengthen the authoritarian regime, Stalin and his supporters distorted Lenin's idea of socialist democracy and the people's genuine self-government. Stalin's barracks of socialism became the antipathy of true socialism—a society of genuine freedom, people's government and social justice.

As speakers pointed out at the conference, neither gross errors nor deviations from socialism could shake the people's faith in its ideals and its potential. Speakers quoted the results of sociological polls showing that most of the Soviet people associate their future with no other social formation but socialism. They hope perestroyka will revive the true values of socialism, the ideals underlying perestroyka, and ways for true masters of production and freedom for everybody to make the most of his or her capabilities.

Professor Anatoliy Butenko, well-known political scientist, summed up the conference by saying now that this country is in the middle of far reaching changes and facing great problems, it must understand their causes to be able to withdraw from the present crisis. We tried at the conference to thrash out the first few results of perestroyka, both its obvious gains and setbacks. Most

agreed we had made success where we had drawn under perestroyka closer to the socialism that Lenin had dreamt about.

Discussion of New Party By-Laws

90UN0430A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
6 Dec 89 Second Edition p 1

[Letters to editor: "What Should the Rules of the CPSU Be?"]

[Text] **A pre-congress discussion was initiated with PRAVDA's publication of "What Should the Rules Be?" (this year's 12 November issue), and Communists and those who are not Party members were invited to take part in it. The editorial office has received the first responses. We are printing part of them.**

The Principle of Territoriality

In accordance with the CPSU Rules, the party is built on a territorial-production basis. What is more, the primary party organizations are established at the place of work of communists, but the rayon, city, and other higher organizations are formed on the territorial principle, and they unite the primary organizations located on the same territory. It seems to me that a transition to the territorial principle from the bottom to the top is more rational. That is, to create a primary organization according to place of residence of the communists (village, settlement, the microrayon of a city), and afterwards to carry out their further unification on the same principle (rayon, city, and oblast).

What do I see as the advantages of such a perestroyka of the organizational structure of the party? First, the production principle has led to a rigid inclusiveness of the party organization in the "command" system of production. Practically all of the basic production questions (and most frequently precisely the production questions) are discussed at party meetings, which in one way or another bind the economic managers. Even in those cases when the agenda is correctly stated ("Concerning the tasks of the party organization...", "Concerning the role of communists...", and there is a "correct" formulation of the decision "To entrust a plant to a communist director...", or "To entrust a shop to a communist chief"), the question still is one of direct "tasking" of economic managers. This lower the initiative and responsibility of economic managers. At the same time little attention is given to party organization educational work in the collective and the resolution of its social problems.

Second, such very important questions surface outside the sphere of activity of party organizations in the branches of the national economy as housing and living conditions, ecological problems, and the organization of trade, rest for the population, training and education of children, and other matters.

True, the Law on State Enterprises (associations) establishes the responsibility of a collective for the resolution of social problems. But practice shows that, most frequently, the party organizations are also subject to the influence of the so-called collective egoism and that they actively defend departmental interests.

The question arises: Will not party influence on production weaken the realization of our proposals? I think that it should not weaken it. First, the territorial primary organizations only broaden the sphere of their influence and their activity, but this does not mean that production enterprises and organizations on a given territory remain outside their interests. Second, as is known, CPSU members belong to such organs in enterprises and organizations as trade union committees and labor collectives, whose role is increased with the transition to the principle of self-management. Through these organs, communists should exercise their influence on the production activity and social life of the collective. In addition, no one prevents communists who work at a given enterprise from getting together and formulating a general party position on one or another question of principle.

The territorial principle of forming primary party organizations, I believe, in large measure is in keeping with the work being conducted by the CPSU on increasing the role of the soviets and the transition to the territorial principle of economic accountability.
[Signed] G. Kanev, deputy chairman of the Presidium of the Komi Scientific Center of the Ural Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences
City of Syktyvkar.

I Am For Direct Elections

The need to renew the party is unquestionable. The mechanism for forming managerial organs of the party organization at all levels, especially at the higher levels, occupies a key place in this process. The existing multilevel system of elections makes it possible to filter and select people for managerial posts who are "acceptable" to the apparatus and upper echelons.

The only way to break this system is the democratization of elections; therefore, I propose to strengthen the provision in the new Rules: Hold direct elections of delegates of the conference and the congress of the party according to territorial-production districts, with a simultaneous nomination of candidates to party committees.
[Signed] V. Ipatov, professor, Leningrad State University.

So That Everyone Would Be a Fighter

Now the primary party organizations are placed in such a position that, as the saying goes, they are stewing in their own juice, and they cannot exercise a real influence on the state of affairs. The criticism that is coming from below is not reaching its target and, as a rule, there is no reaction to it.

Therefore, we expect that provisions will be consolidated in the new CPSU Rules so that each communist, not to mention party organization, will be able to participate in the formulation of the policy of the entire party and feel like a full-fledged member of the party. Criticism and self-criticism should in fact, and not just in words, be the driving force of the party.

In our opinion, the rules need a special article which gives the right of free withdrawal from the party on application by a communist. Convinced communists should remain in the party who stand firmly on Marxist-Leninist positions and who can defend the ideological views of the party in political discussions, and any kind of compulsion here is damaging.

The right of exclusion from the party and acceptance into its ranks should be given fully to primary party organizations.
[Signed] A. Tanitovskiy, secretary of territorial party organization No 6,
City of Baltsy, Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Deserving Mercy

I am a pensioner, an invalid, incurably ill and bedridden, but they will come for party dues, and they take what is owed. Where is the party compassion and human sensitivity here?

A communist who gave his strength and health to the cause deserves mercy. That is why we believe: Dues should not be taken from members of the party who are on pension and who have been classified as invalids or seriously ill.

And there is one more pressing question. Pensioners, invalids, and the incurably ill, cannot attend party meetings, and they cannot participate in the work of the party organization, as is required by the CPSU Rules. In our opinion, such communists should be issued party cards as an honorary right, and they should be granted the right to attend party meetings on their own initiative.
[Signed] A. Drozdov, A. Zagaykov, and A. Zhuravel, veterans of the party and labor
City of Kharkov.

No to Cooptation!

The CPSU Rules state that "democratic centralism is the guiding principle of the organizational structure, life, and activity of the party." And the first paragraph, which interprets this principle, mentions "the election of all leadership organs of the party from the bottom to the top." Nonetheless, this provision more often than not is violated at all stages of party leadership (except perhaps for primary party organizations). The cooptation of members of the leadership of party organs right up to the first secretaries of republic central committees of the Communist Party, which has been condemned by the party, continues to be practiced.

I propose to write into the CPSU Rules: Cooptation in the leadership of the party organs is not permissible.
[Signed] I. Broy, CPSU member since 1941
City of Tallinn.

Apathy, Lack of Competition Mar Kazakh Elections

PM1412161589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by own correspondent O. Stefashin: "Poll Indications"]

[Text] Karaganda—Not much time now remains before the local soviet deputy elections take place in Kazakhstan, but no one yet is really sure that they are not going to flop in some places.

The anxiety caused by the passivity of the population back at the initial stage of the election campaign has now markedly intensified during meetings between voters and candidates. Most people leave them with their mind firmly made up not to take part in the elections scheduled for 24 December. The latest poll carried out by the Karaganda Oblast party committee public opinion research group showed that virtually 1 in 4 men under 30 has clearly stated that he will not be going to the polling station, 8 percent of respondents are still undecided, and only the older generation has expressed its unanimous readiness to fulfill its "honored civic duty."

The situation in Kazakhstan is certainly complex and it makes one seriously wonder about the cause of the rapid decline in voters' interest in forming the new body of deputies and the future organs of local power. It seems to me that the candidates themselves are partly to blame for this. Lacking adequate experience of electioneering, many of them have not met with their voters and build their program on shaky ground that is bound to give way. This naturally annoys people. And indeed the absence of multiple candidates in okrugs altogether removes any desire they have to vote. In fact, what kind of election is it when, say in Kustanay Oblast's Oktyabrskiy Rayon, there are only...261 contenders for 260 rural soviets seats.

The other day representatives of the oblast workers' strike committee urged the population to boycott elections wherever "unopposed" leaders were registered as candidate deputies. It is difficult to guess what the consequences of this patently ill-considered step by the miners will be. One thing is clear, however, it is scarcely going to help normalize the situation and who can tell whether it won't result in elections in some places having to be started all over again.

CPSU's Girenko Tours Crimean Oblast 30 Nov-2 Dec

LD0412155889 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Dec 89 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Meetings With Voters"]

[Text] USSR People's Deputy A.N. Girenko, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, was in the Crimea 30 November through 2 December.

During his stay in the oblast he visited Simferopol, Sevastopol, and Yalta, where he met with voters, party and soviet workers, the ideological aktiv, and journalists.

A.N. Girenko was accompanied on his tour of the Crimea by N.V. Bagrov, first secretary of Crimean Oblast Party Committee.

AUCCTU Plenum Information Report

904F0046A Moscow TRUD in Russian 5 Dec 89 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Information Report on a Plenum of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions"]

[Text] The Seventh Plenum of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU] took place yesterday in Moscow.

The plenum considered the question "The Position and Tactics of the Trade Unions During the Course of the Elections to Republic and Local Organs of Power."

AUCCTU deputy chairman G.I. Yanayev presented the report on the matter up for discussion (G.I. Yanayev's report is published on pages 2 and 3 of this issue).

The following took part in the discussion of the report: the chairman of the Leningrad Oblast trade union council, V.I. Korzhov; the brigade leader of the brigade of electricians from the Novokramatorskiy machine-building plant production association (Donetsk Oblast), N.V. Nemchenko; the chairman of the Estonian republic trade union council, S.U. Kallas; a machine tool operator in the forging section of the Volgogradskiy tractor plant production association, A.A. Belyakov; the secretary of the Moscow city trade union council, V.S. Stroganov; the chairman of the Kokchetav Oblast trade union council, M.A. Chzhen; a rotary machine tool operator at the "Elektrostaltyazhmash" Production Association (Moscow Oblast), V.M. Yarygin; the secretary of the Ukrainian republic trade union council, S.S. Yevtushenko; the chairman of the trade union of coal industry workers central committee M.A. Srebnyy; the foreman in the "Mamontovneft" Oil and Gas Recovery Administration at the "Yuganskneftegaz Production Association (Tyumen Oblast), V.V. Gustov; the brigade leader of a mechanized brigade at the "Ivancha" sovkhoz [state farm] in the "Dnestr" Scientific-Production Association (the Moldavian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]). M.A. Gashper; the chairman of the Gomel Oblast trade union council, V.D. Leskov; the captain of the seine trawler "Trud" from the Vladivostok base of the trawler and refrigerator fleet in the "Dalryba" Production Association, L.V. Sustov; a glassblower from the Ryazan Production Association for Electronic Instruments, R.G. Voronina; the chairman of the Gorkiy Oblast committee of the trade union for workers in the shipbuilding industry, V.V. Payshchikov; the chairman of the Alma-Ata Oblast trade union council, M. Moldakhmetov; the general director of the "Baltiyskiy plant" association (Leningrad city), V.N. Shershnev; a railroad electrician in the Volga Railroad Saratov remote-control section, V.S. Krasovskaya; a mobile excavator operator in the Narva "Estonslanets" Production Association, T.K. Pupkevich; a student at the Moscow State University imeni M.V. Lomonosov, O.Ye. Grishina; the chairman of the Tatar Oblast committee trade union for medical workers, N.A. Shakhtorina.

AUCCTU Chairman S.A. Shalayev delivered the closing address.

Giving due consideration to the proposals put forward in the debate on the report, the plenum adopted an AUCCTU appeal to members of the trade unions and all citizens of the country, and a resolution "The Position and Tactics of the Trade Unions During the Course of the Elections to the Republic and Local Organs of Power (the documents adopted by the plenum will be published).

The plenum elected the chairman of the trade union central committee for workers in the power station and electrotechnical industries as a member of the AUCCTU Presidium.

Those involved in the work of the plenum included USSR people's deputies from the trade unions councils, a number of members of the USSR Supreme Soviet from among the workers, the chairmen of the central committees and trade union councils that are not members of the AUCCTU, representatives of the trade union associations of aircrews in USSR Civil Aviation, and trade union organizations of students in VUZ's in the USSR, the All-Union Federation of Trade Union Organizations for joint-venture enterprises, and the newly created trade union for cooperative workers in the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic, and members of the organizational committee to form a Russian trade union council, a number of trade union activist from Moscow city and oblast, and representatives of the mass media.

The first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Party Building and Cadre Work Department, Ye.Z. Razumov, took part in the work of the plenum.

Resolution on Elections

904F0048A Moscow TRUD in Russian 6 Dec 89 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Resolution of the Seventh AUCCTU Plenum: The Position and Tactics of the Trade Unions During the Course of the Elections to Republic and Local Organs of Power"]

[Text] The plenum of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU] notes that the campaign for the election of people's deputies to republic and local organs of power which is now underway everywhere is an event of exceptional sociopolitical and state importance.

It signifies a new stage in the political reform as a result of which an integrated of popular power will be created in the USSR. Fully empowered soviets of people's deputies are acquiring along with their great rights, full responsibility for the socioeconomic development of their own regions. The further course of perestroyka and the fate of the country and of socialism depend largely on who will be elected to them.

It is the immediate duty of the trade unions to be actively involved in the election campaign and to strive for a situation in which the most worthy and convinced fighters for the renewal of socialist society, those who enjoy the deserved respect and trust of the working people are nominated and elected to the posts of people's deputy.

The Seventh AUCCTU Plenum resolves as follows:

1. To adopt the "Appeal of the AUCCTU to the Members of Trade Unions and All Citizens of the Country."

To recommend that, giving due consideration to the AUCCTU position as set forth in the appeal, trade union councils and committees draw up specific programs of action for the election platforms during the course of the preparations for the elections to republic and local organs of power.

To proceed from the premise that the trade unions are going to the elections as an independent public force capable of expressing, realizing, and defending the social and professional interests of all categories of workers and the country's population. During the election campaign the focus of attention for the trade unions should be the nomination and active support, in accordance with the laws passed by the union republics, of candidates from the labor collectives and authoritative representatives of the leading creative classes in society—the workers and peasants and the laboring intelligentsia—and also trade union activists, and for their ability and readiness to defend the interests of the workers.

2. To recommend that trade union committees and primary trade union organizations at enterprises, kolkhozes [collective farms], and educational institutions work out in good time and comprehensively substantiate their proposals on candidates for the posts of soviets of people's deputies, and also define their attitudes toward candidates from other public organizations.

Work should be developed everywhere, openly and publicly, to nominate candidates for the posts of deputies at meetings of the labor collectives, gatherings of voters at places of residence, and plenums of rayon, city, oblast, kray, and republic trade union organs.

In all this work they should proceed from the advisability of nominating candidates as people's deputies from particular large and small primary trade union organizations, and should strive to achieve in each electoral okrug the nomination of a candidate for the mandate of deputy from the trade unions or from other organizations and movements whose goals and tasks are close to those of the trade unions.

3. The trade union councils and committees should pay special attention to giving real help to the candidates supported by the trade unions in their election struggle, and in working out with each of them a clear-cut and realistic program which, equally with the urgent problems of sociocultural development and the ecology, would reflect ways to improve management in the region.

4. To establish permanent business contacts between trade union organs and other mass organizations (youth, women's, veteran's, and so forth), the creative unions and the various public movements, and to determine the feasibility of cooperating in the election campaign by nominating joint candidates. To act in the elections in a unified bloc with the communist party and all progressive forces acting from positions aimed at strengthening and enhancing the role of the soviets as organs of true popular power and the interests of socialist renewal, and at affirming the ideals of social justice and the spiritual renewal of society.

5. Trade union committees and councils shall actively realize the right, guaranteed by law, of free and comprehensive discussion of the political, business, and personal qualities of candidates for the post of people's deputy, and to make effective use of the entire arsenal of possibilities for the trade unions and their cultural and enlightenment institutions and sports facilities for agitation for candidates to posts of people's deputies nominated and supported by trade union organizations.

To organize a smooth-running system to take account of and generalize instructions, proposals, and complaints from the workers, and to react to them promptly and in a businesslike manner, and immediately to inform the public about steps taken.

To set up voters' clubs in trade union clubs, houses and palaces of culture, red corners, and sports facilities, and to organize mass meetings, and meetings and interviews between candidates and electors. To propagandize broadly the AUCCTU Appeal and the election platforms of the local trade union organizations, and candidates' programs, and to produce bright and convincing placards, pamphlets, and other materials.

The trade unions in general and each trade union organization in particular should use the election campaign and the upsurge in public activeness resulting from it to make significant improvements in all their own activity, intensify their defensive functions and the struggle against violations of labor, social, and other constitutional rights of Soviet people, and create the conditions required for productive labor and spiritual and physical development.

Telephone Link Answers Miners' Questions

904F0022A Moscow TRUD in Russian 10 Nov 89 p 1

[Readers' questions and answers: "Direct, From the Mine"]

[Text] **The first questions from workers of the country's coal regions have come over the direct line from the mine (see TRUD for 5 November 89). Today we are publishing the answers received from the USSR Council of Ministers' Bureau for the Fuel and Energy Complex.**

"Decree No 608 signed by the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers N.I. Ryzhkov on 3 August of this year is a kind of guarantee given by the country's highest executive authority to participants in the miners' strikes. How is it being implemented today?"
[Signed] A. Chernenko, Kemerovo.

The results of the implementation of the decisions as of the beginning of November of this year were considered at a conference with the participation of officials of the USSR Council of Ministers, the AUCCTU [All-Union Central Trade Union Council], and representatives of mining labor collectives and the special commission for monitoring the fulfillment of the miners' demand that was created under the Central Committee of the Trade Union of Coal Industry Workers. Reports were heard from the USSR Ministry of the Coal Industry, the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, the USSR Ministry of Health, and other ministries, departments, and organizations.

Of the overall package of assignments, in keeping with the decree, as of 1 November 1989 144 had been accepted for execution. Moreover, in addition to this, there were decisions regarding 27 other assignments that encompass various socioeconomic and production-economic problems.

"What specific kinds of additional payments have been introduced for coal industry workers?"
[Signed] R. Musrepov, Karaganda.

Additional payments have been set for workers of coal industry and mine construction enterprises for working on the evening and night shifts. They pay 20% of the wage rate or salary for work on the evening shift and 40% for the night shift.

Additional payments have also been set for those who are permanently employed in underground work for the average amount of time they spend in the mine traveling from the face to the place where they are working and back.

Additional rayon coefficients have been set for wages for workers in the Pechora Basin, particularly in Inta—1.5, Vorkut—1.6, the village of Khalmer-Yu—1.7, and Kemerovo Oblast—1.3.

Beginning with the second quarter of 1990 it is intended to increase rayon coefficients to wages for workers of enterprises and organizations of the coal industry located in Karaganda Oblast.

The workers' suggestions to pay a one-time award for long service to workers performing construction and installation work by the self-financing method and to retain the length of service for calculating northern increments when transferring from one enterprise to another have been accepted.

In order to cover expenditures related to the introduction of additional benefits for workers of the coal industry, the wage fund for 1989 has been increased at the expense of the state budget by R517.6 million, which will be more than R1 billion for the entire year.

We remind you that the number of the direct editorial telephone is 299-49-06 from 1000 to 1200 Moscow time.

Yakovlev Briefs Church Figures on Papal Meeting

LD0812050689 Moscow TASS in English 1931 GMT 7 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 7 TASS—Politburo member Aleksander Yakovlev met today permanent members of the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church Metropolitan Filaret of Kiev and Galich, Metropolitan Filaret of Minsk and Grodno, Metropolitan Yuvenaly of Krutitsy and Kolomna, Metropolitan Vladimir of Rostov and Novocherkassk and Archbishop Kyril of Smolensk and Kaliningrad.

Yakovlev briefed the members of the Holy Synod on the results of the meeting between Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and Pope John Paul of the Roman Catholic Church, that took place in Rome on December 1.

Details of New Magazine Outlined

PM2011114189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Nov 89 First Edition p 2

[Interview with B. Yudin, chief editor of new magazine CHELOVEK, by V. Kerimov under the "Our Interviews" rubric: "The Main Asset Is Man"—date and place not specified; first two paragraphs are reader's letter]

[Excerpt] "I read in your newspaper about the creation of CHELOVEK, a new mass circulation illustrated sociopolitical and popular science magazine under the Center of Human Sciences.

"Could you tell us precisely when its first issue will appear and whether it is possible to subscribe to it? Yu. Tolpygo, Moscow."

We began our conversation with Doctor of Philosophical Sciences B. Yudin, chief editor of CHELOVEK, with that reader's question.

[Yudin] The journal will appear about twice monthly beginning early in 1990. It is too late to subscribe to the

first issue but in general there are no subscription restrictions, the magazine's index number is 71076, and a year's subscription will cost R9.60.

[Kerimov] As I understand it, work on the first issue is in full swing. What can the reader expect to find in it?

[Yudin] Articles of the most varied kind. A. Bayev, for example, talks about new approaches to the understanding of human genetics, L. Radzikhovskiy deals trenchantly with the question of psychiatric treatment methods, and A. Bozhovich studies the treatment of man in the films of A. Tarkovskiy. You can't describe everything because the magazine is quite large—about 24 printer's sheets.

[Kerimov] And it is illustrated. Does your magazine really need pictures?

[Yudin] Undoubtedly. The first issue, for example, is going to publish S. Dali's "Diary of a Genius." There will be reproductions of some of his pictures. Illustrations for our magazine are not an embellishment but an important and vivid way of presenting information. [passage omitted]

Economic

Foreign Aid Viewed, Revisions Suggested

PM1312151689 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No. 49, 3 Dec 89 p 6

[Andrey Kortunov article: "Soviet Foreign Aid. Is It Always Put to Wisest Use?"]

[Text] The expenditures part of the USSR budget for 1990 envisages apportioning 26,421,362,000 roubles "to finance foreign trade, outlays on state banking, commercial operations, on rendering free aid to foreign countries and other expenditures on international contacts". To collect this sum, every inhabitant—from new-born babies to grey-haired old folks—must pay nearly 100 roubles a year. The Law on the budget does not mention specifically what these appropriations will be used for.

It is clear, however, that the lion's share of the 26 billion will be allocated for foreign aid. According to the Foreign Minstry's figures, in the current fiscal year, its total volume totalled over 12 billion roubles or 1.4 per cent of the GNP.

In the foreign aid-GNP ration the USSR surpasses the FRG threefold, Britain - 3.5-fold, and the USA - nearly sixfold. The USSR's lagging behind the leading Western nations in the main indices of economic development in the 1980s has had no effect whatsoever on this ratio.

The aid programmes look more than impressive also in comparison with the other items of the state budget. The sum of 12 billion exceeds by one-third the appropriations for science or for law-enforcement bodies, three and a half times the expenses on education, vocational training, culture, art and mass media taken together, and 21 times the outlays on public health and physical education. This sum nearly equals all the outlays on activities aimed at raising the people's living standard in 1990 (13.4 billion roubles).

It would be good to interpret this generosity as bearing witness to the priority of universal human interests over national ones in Soviet policies. But do we really help those in need? The geographic distribution of our aid shows that this isn't so. According to Western estimates (further on I will have to operate mainly with Western estimates in view of the absence of official Soviet data), Cuba accounts for a least a quarter of the total volume of economic assistance - about three billion roubles a year. It is no secret that we buy Cuban sugar for a price four times the world average.

It's no secret that many Third World recipients of Soviet aid are notorious for their authoritarian or dictatorial methods of rule, the cults of their leaders, a ruthless suppression of the opposition, and for corruption.

The effectiveness of Soviet economic asistance is still questionable. The press has repeatedly criticized the desire for "megalomania", for prestigious and costly projects hardly suitable to the economic structures of developing nations. Examples of a departmental approach were cited, cases of meaningless waste of resources, the counterproductive effect of many programmes. Not infrequently, together with aid, Moscow also exported the worst principles of the adminstrative economic system: red tape, a dominance of "gross output", an expense-based approach. As a result, most recipients of Soviet aid were never able to overcome the stagnation of their economy, and in some of them production is generally dwindling.

But the main thing, I believe, is not even this. According to Western estimates, the USSR's economic assistance comprises not more than one-third of its military aid to other countries. To all appearances, military aid, at least some part of it, is included in other items of the state budget. Specifically, the item on defence spending. In terms of military aid, the share of finances, detracted from the share of finances, detracted from the USSR national economy, considerably surpasses 1.4 percent of the GNP.

The Soviet Union accounts for less than five per cent of the total world export. But Soviet arms exports amount, according to Western estimates, to 28 percent of the world level (32 percent of the arms deliveries to Third World countries). In the 1980s, on the average 25 percent of all arms, made in the USSR, were later exported. The exported items included not only Kalashnikov submachine guns; according to American estimates, throughout the 1980s the Soviet Union has supplied the Third World countries with 7,925 tanks and self-propelled gun mounts, 20,470 artillery pieces, 17 submarines, 2,620 supersonic aircraft, 1,705 helicopters, and 32,210 SA class missiles. Moreover, these weapons

are delivered to the "hottest" flashpoints—to the Middle East, Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The word "export" in the given case must not be misleading. Only very few—mainly petroleum-producing Third World countries—can pay for arms deliveries (and even they have been increasingly reluctant to do so in recent years). The overwhelming majority of arms recepients buy them on credit (these debts run to billions of roubles in the case of Ethiopia, Angola and South Yemen). The repayment of debts is being ever deferred, and quite often the debts are simply written off.

At a definite stage of history Soviet military aid assisted in strengthening newly-emergent states' independence. But in many cases it also added to the deformation of their political development, the excessive influence of the military, and the militarization of the whole social life. Sometimes this aid encouraged adventurism in foreign policy and bellicosity in relation to neighbours. Soviet military aid has been used by repressive regimes to suppress domestic opposition, national minorities and religious movements.

Of course, it is not the USSR alone that supplies arms to developing nations. The USA, France and Britain account for a sizeable portion of the world arms export. Sometimes Soviet deliveries are necessary to re-establish the regional balances of strength. But in this field, as in other spheres of military activity, Moscow has not always abided by the principle of reasonable sufficiency, thereby provoking a corresponding response from the west.

How has Soviet military aid changed during the perestroika years? Alas, here as well we have no adequate official figures. Foreign estimates are rather contradictory: this aid is evidently dwindling in some regions, but increasing in others. At any rate, no revolutionary change has been in evidence, in this sphere.

There is hardly a need to say how perniciously the "inertia" of approaches to this question tells on the USSR's international positions. Trust in the very foundations of new political mentality is being sapped. Questions arise with regard to the moral content of the USSR's policy. There arise glaring "double standards", when active and very bold steps to reduce the armed forces in Europe and the strategic arsenals of the USSR and the USA get along with encouraging the stockpiling, improvement and ruinous use of arms in other regions.

I do not at all call for the complete termination of economic or military aid. But it is time to put things in order in this as well as other areas of expenditures. There is a need to publish detailed information on our system of giving aid, the terms of granting it, and its distribution according to countries and regions.

Obviously, the Supreme Soviet should consider and approve not "packages" of expenditures on foreign policy, but specific programmes and projects. Moreover, in mapping out future aid programmes, there is a need to discard as soon as possible the cold war stereotypes, when any anti-American regime in the Third World, declaring allegiance to Marxism-Leninism, could count on Soviet support. Today it is a fully feasible objective to secure that Soviet aid and aid from the West should not be antithetical but, conversely, should completement each other. Big opportunities are opening up for different multilateral aid projects, to which Moscow can make an appreciable contribution.

As far as arms sales to the Third World are concerned, life itself imperatively demands that the main exporters, including the USSR, should start urgent negotiations aimed at limiting these sales. To begin with, it could be possible to agree to ban the transfer of more sophisticated and dangerous military technologies to Third World countries. It might be advisable to touch upon this question also at the coming Soviet-American summit meeting.

Lastly, part of the economic and humanitarian aid could be channelled not along state lines, but through public, non-governmental organizations, various kinds of foundations and associations. I am sure that quite a number of people in the USSR would solidarize with the peoples of developing countries and be eager to contribute to their efforts to combat economic backwardness. Let people themselves decide what their money should be spent on: Aid to revolutionary regimes in Central America, or the restoration of the Church of Christ the Saviour.

Workers Air Problems at Railroad Conference

PM1312150989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 1

[V. Romanyuk report: "Trains on Contract"]

[Text] The All-Union Railroad Workers' Conference was held in Moscow.

The day before, the conference's participants adopted an appeal to the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies in which they gave assurances that the workers of the steel highways would do everything within their power to ensure that their shipments meet as far as possible the needs of the national economy and the population.

Reports on sections' work were heard. We shall single out just some of the problems which were discussed. The railroad workers made better use of cars' capacity, but their turnover time not only is not being reduced, but has even increased. Moreover, of the 200,000 defective cars only 80,000 are being repaired, and the rest are allowed to circulate in a defective state. It was proposed to set up an industrial concern to organize the repair of rolling stock and the production of spare parts.

The poor standard of service to passengers is provoking a mass of complaints. In those places where the train teams have switched to lease contract, matters have

noticeably improved, and passengers are getting good commercial and information services.

There was an ardent discussion on the problem of ensuring safe travel. The conference participants came to the conclusion that this process is controllable. It is based on discipline and strict observance of the personnel's conditions as regards labor and time off. This fact was also cited: Locomotive teams worked continuously for 25-30 hours in a row at the Tbilisi Railroad Section, which created a danger of accidents occurring.

The conference's participants drew another conclusion: The new economic mechanism introduced in industry cannot be utilized in railroad transportation without modification. For instance, it is prompting an increase in shipments in every way. As a result, in three years the operating costs increased by 7.5 percent (R1.1 billion), and the increase in the volume of work was slight. The idea of the need to maintain executive-directive management methods as well as economic ones was expressed in various forms.

Finally, social questions were raised in pointed terms. First and foremost, housing construction. In three years the number of those on the waiting list fell by 52,000 families, but today 440,000 families of railroad workers—neither more nor less—are on the waiting list for housing. In this connection the initiative the railroad sections' collectives where the workers are actively participating in housing construction—for themselves and their comrades—deserves attention. The poor quality of protective clothing, the slow reduction in the amount of heavy manual work, and the inadmissibility of using women's labor here were discussed.

V. Tetenov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union Commission for Questions of Transportation, Communications, and Information Technology, speaking to the conference participants, stated that it has been suggested that the government increase deliveries of electric locomotives, diesel engines, passenger cars, and rails in 1990. The commission's proposals are being sympathetically received by the central departments.

L. Voronin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, took part in the conference work. Summing up the conference, he drew the railroad workers' attention to eliminating the bottlenecks, reducing irrational crosshauls and transportation costs, and speeding up car turnaround.

The radical modernization of railroad transportation is on the agenda today.

The participants of the All-Union Railroad Workers Conference adopted an appeal to all the sector's workers. The idea behind it is that all the problems must be solved not by destructive strikes, but by labor and unity.

Criticism of Trade Union Organs Discussed

904F0044A Moscow TRUD in Russian
2 Dec 89 p 2

[Article by Ye. Boshnyakov, docent at the Higher Trade Union School of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions: "A One-Way Street. On the Subject of Certain Pieces Published on the Trade Unions"]

[Text] Until recently our press rarely wrote about the activity of the trade union organizations. On most holidays the political commentators merely reminded us that we are a "school of communism." Suddenly the dam has burst. The former *"terra incognita"* for the mass media has unexpectedly become almost a fashionable subject. Quickly, as if on command, many people have started to abuse the trade unions, or more accurately, the position of the trade unions. Moreover, the abuse is not for past passivity or mistakes, of which there were more than enough. Strange as it may seem, the target of the criticism (sometimes very emotional and unsubstantiated) is the practical actions of the trade unions in truly defending the rights and legitimate interests of the workers!

Let us refer just to some of these pieces that have been published.

Thus, in his statements on television and in the newspaper VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA, the well-known economist N. Shmelev has accused the trade unions of "whipping up passions." In what did he see such a strange position? I quote from the text of his interview (VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA, 12 October):

"Instead of defending the interests of the workers, with their heads given into the hands of economic administrators, they are busy dealing with the causes that give rise to strikes, and they (the trade unions—author's note) hasten to find someone on whom to shift the evil that has built up (?!) and let off steam. They are devouring what they have created (?!). But we must offer a full response to this. The retreat and the return to the rusted rails of the administrative-command system, for which they are essentially calling, is not simply turning the marker back to its former position, but is leading the country into impasse, into economic and social catastrophe (?!)"

This, then, is the excessively emotional vagary of a major specialist in the field of economics. It is as if he has not examined the stance assumed by the mass organization of the workers itself. He has not taken into account the fact that reflecting the demands and wishes of the workers, today it is also acting against the very economic administrators who previously failed to consider the social consequences of their own actions and proposed measures that led neither to stabilization of the economy nor to improvement in the life of the people. One of the active supporters of the economic reform has taken up arms against the trade unions for nothing. It is difficult to imagine that an expert like N. Shmelev does not know what he is doing.... Life has shown that if the model

proposed by the theoretical economists do not lead to a rise in the living standards for the popular masses, then it is doomed to failure. The now classic example of this is the plan for a bright future in 1980. Can it be that he has learned nothing? The active position of the trade unions in defending the interests of the workers has, in my opinion, simply scared someone. Someone has obviously become nervous, seeing that the elected organs of the trade unions are striving to secure a firm place in defending the economic and social interests of the people of labor. One thinks involuntarily that the support that the working class gives the position of trade unions has, as it were, upset many people. Is it not that they themselves were counting on that support but somehow miscalculated?

Or take another author—S. Verigin. His position can be seen in the very title of his article: "We Want a Better Life Now!" One asks: Ultimately why not? Given all the complexities and the "labor intensiveness" of this task.... Are not the good old slogans such as "money does not bring happiness" dearer to the heart of the author? With what are the trade unions charged if not improving the life of the workers? Can one seriously think that, as before, they will merely "share responsibility" for the organization of labor, sum up the results of socialist competition, and help the administration to master new forms of management? You are wrong if you do. Is it worth the time reading lessons in morality to the trade unions?

In another published piece one respected scholar accuses the trade unions of nothing more nor less than "rightist conservatism." Is this a good label? According to its logic it turns out that the present activeness of the trade union workers has been dictated by the pursuit of votes in the upcoming elections to the local organs of power. The support of the workers for the decisions of the Sixth AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions] Plenum is explained, so he says, by the formula: "People often do not care for what they create." In passing, the author opens readers' eyes to the fact that the trade unions are actively acquiring much more power than the state apparatus since they are engaged in spreading the deficits by enterprise.

The author can hardly fail to be aware that the deficit created, incidentally, by the inadequate competence of the state apparatus, is being spread here not by the trade unions, but first and foremost by the local soviets. It is just as difficult to agree with the assertion that "people do not care for what they create." No, they do "care" for it, and very well, when they feel the pain in their pocket. But certain theorists do not care for it up in their "ivory towers" (but not in the mines of the Kuzbass and the Donbass).

Here is another turn in the "fashionable" subject. In NEDELYA (No 43), USSR People's Deputy S. Stankevich assesses the aims of trade union activity in the struggle against distortions in the cooperative movement as follows: "To deflect the blow (?!) from the bureaucratic apparatus, particularly the trade union apparatus, which has manifestly been felt as undermining its prestige...." First, of course, here we have an obvious "rectification" and coarsening of the situation. Second, the esteemed deputy (for whom, incidentally I voted and did not think I had made an error in my choice) perceives the situation poorly in that having recognized the true state of affairs, the trade unions have taken it upon themselves to enhance their prestige, and to do this using a legitimate, and indeed the only correct way for the trade union workers; namely, defending the legitimate interests of the workers. For in the harsh light of day, this is why the trade unions exist....

However, our dispute will hardly lead to the truth. When people have differing viewpoints on the same subject their assessments and opinions rarely coincide. In all of this, it is another phenomenon that is of greater interest. Why have our "pluralistic" mass media suddenly "moved into a one-way street," trying to create as rapidly as possible a negative attitude toward the positions occupied by the trade unions?

"Quo vadis?": This was the question the Romans asked in such cases during the time of the ancient democracy and glasnost. In translation this means "whither goest thou?," and in language closer to our times, "why is this suddenly necessary?"

In looking for an answer to this let us make use of the retrospective method. We remember how the press assessed the activity of the trade union organizations during the recent actions by the miners. There were several criticisms aimed at particular workers who were serving their time in groups and hiding in offices awaiting the development of events. True, there had been signals that there were very influential authorities in Kemerovo and Magadan, and later in Gorkiy, and that their zealous representatives had "been pressuring" the trade union workers, threatening them with serious penalties for becoming actively involved in the struggle for the legitimate interests of the people of labor. Not all trade union leaders are well endowed with the courage to deal with this kind of pressure. However, with the exception of some of the pieces published in TRUD, there was, in my opinion, no particular concern in the press about this.... I think that it is important for us all to see what is most important; namely, the extent to which perestroyka is altering the awareness of the working class and the trade unions, which are beginning to recognize seriously their own strength and responsibility, and their opportunities to exert an active influence on the processes taking place in society.

As a result (there is such an "innocent" turn in some assessments) during all the misfortunes of the summer and autumn and the shocks in the economy, attempts were sometimes made to blame the strikers while disregarding those who one way or another had provoked the workers to this extreme and, of course, undesirable, action. For it is important that the trade union organs try to draw the correct conclusions from the new and sharp

facts of the workers' movement this summer, and it seems to me that it would be correct to support them in this.

One way or another, but unexpectedly for many, the increased opposition from the trade unions to the technocracy and to departmental diktat not only attracted the attention of the public, but also became a reassuring "innovation" in public life. But all of this could easily have been foreseen. There were signs that the workers and the trade unions also were not thrilled with the distortions in the cooperative movement (and I mean distortions), and with some of the economic initiatives such as "freezing" wages at many enterprises without securing any restraint on price rises. But they were disregarded. So the trade union aktiv also started to look for more energetic forms of action. How could it be otherwise when the general position of the trade unions as set forth in the instructions given the USSR people's deputies from this organization to the Supreme Soviet and government remained virtually unanswered? The mass media should give serious attention to demands of the country's mass public organization. For those instructions included much that was incorporated in the decisions of the Sixth AUCCTU Plenum and the resolutions passed at meetings, and it has the support of the workers. Indeed, of the Supreme Soviet itself. I think that all we need do is refer to the recent USSR Supreme Soviet decisions on bringing proper order to the activity of particular cooperatives, and on stabilizing prices for everyday commodities. Steps have been taken (again thanks largely to the active and combative position of the trade unions) to raise the living standard of pensioners, who are least well protected in the social sense. At the initiative and with the active involvement of the AUCCTU, radical new draft legislation has been drawn up regarding pensions and vacations....

Does this not testify that the Soviet trade unions are moving away from their position of passiveness and becoming a real and independent force in our society, a force that stands on guard over the vital interests of the workers? A force that defends those who have little, the people of labor, against attempts to patch up the holes in the budget and stabilize the economy at the expense of those do not have bulging purses but stand at the machine tools, hack out the coal at the face, and grow the grain? In their instructions they wrote directly that allocations for social needs cannot be reduced. It is essential to abandon the annual sacrifices of enormous material and currency reserves on the altar of development only of the base sectors.

I do not think I am mistaken in saying that during the period of the election struggle for the deputy seats in the republic and local soviets, the position of the trade unions was the subject of new attacks. It was not happenstance that the proposal from workers in Leningrad and other cities to hold the elections for production-based electoral okrugs aroused the ire of certain "professional political experts." Even though it is clear to any unprejudiced person that the workers themselves are the ones who know their own problems best and are able to resolve them fairly.

We would not have engaged in polemics with our opponents were the action not so obviously all taking place "on a one-way street." In our view, this all creates in people a false idea about the processes taking place in society and about ways to resolve problems in the economy. It seems to us that some political commentators who because of their conservative thinking are incapable of assessing the prospects for radical programs that have been proposed are trying to depict the trade unions as the "image of the enemy."

This kind of approach to the resolution of problems is forcing the trade unions to galvanize their own actions even though as they do so they are evidently also "overstepping the mark." I think that given the desire of every economist or political commentator would be able to understand that the trade unions, now being reborn, are not against economic reform, but they are against the traditional ideas about management of the national economy that promise (yet again) some undefined beautiful future instead of making use of all opportunities to effect real improvements in life today.

West Kazakh Gold Mine Visit Reported

PM1412103189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Dec 89 First Edition p 6

[Report by "Our correspondent" Dmitriy Gutenev under the rubric "Biased Reportage": "Where Do They Mine Gold? In the Mountains, Dmitriy Gutenev, Our Correspondent for West Kazakhstan is Convinced"; first four paragraphs appear to be conversation between PRAVDA and Gutenev]

[Text] "And do they extract a lot?"

"No one will give me an answer to that question. As is well known, our country is a major one in terms of the extraction and deposits of this precious metal. But official figures are not announced. Foreign specialists believe that approximately 250-300 tonnes of gold a year are mined in our country. If you are to believe the sources which claim that an annual average of 1,300 tonnes is mined on the planet, our country's share is not that small. On the world market the price of gold has increased tenfold over the past two decades. So any deposit of any size is valuable to us."

"In general it is customary to believe that we mine gold mainly in Siberia and the Far East...."

"I used to think that too until I visited.... But everything in the proper order."

We went deeper into the mountains along the bad asphalt road. There was an uncovered trench immediately beyond the pass. The cross section of topsoil removed from it is of unprecedentedly variegated color over 30 meters.

This diversity of color is the surest sign that there are many kinds of minerals in the Mugodzhary mountains. The southern extremity of the Urals, which edges deep into the Kazakh steppe, is rich in chromites, copper, nickel, titanium.... In 1964 local geologists also found gold ore in the Shakarburlak area.

I picked up a pebble, similar in appearance to a crushed stone. I could distinguish on its surface a glitter reminiscent of a snow flake and little yellow spots. That was the gold. They opened a production facility for this small amount?

Later we visited a laboratory. Kh. Mamenova, the laboratory chief, acquainted us with the complex extraction process as a result of which 50 grammes of ground ore in a small magnesite pipet there remains a small spot three to four times the size of the full stop at the end of this sentence. The gold content in all the ore is determined on the basis of three such little spots. From four to 12 grammes in one tonne of ore. Not a lot? How to put it.... After crushing, the ore is dispatched by truck to Emba and from there by railroad to the plants where the gold proper and the other metals are extracted.

But I would be one-sided if I did not mention the problems. It turns out that they also exist in our gold extraction sector. The mine should have reached its proposed capacity back in 1975 but even today it is a long way from that frontier.

Nonetheless the mine is highly profitable. It maintains the Vasilkov mining and enrichment combine, which has three times the number of workers and is little concerned for the development of its benefactor. That is not surprising. Managing thousands of miles away is difficult—the mine is in Aktyubinsk Oblast but the mining and enrichment combine is in Kokchetav.

"That is why," Chief Engineer M. Niyetkaliyev says, "there is a shortage of raw material and we are obliged to hold on to obsolete excavators and bulldozers and venerable drills.... There is a permanent shortage of spare parts. Telephone communications are unreliable. The road is in a deplorable state."

Here is another paradox of our economic structures. He who is richer and works better supports on his shoulders the parasite who according to the departmental hierarchical scheme issues orders but does not help. Why should the mine not become an independent production unit?

...We left the mountains before daybreak. There was a holdup at the railroad crossing. The light signal's red eye blinked. The green light came one for the rolling stock, which disappeared into the winter night with the Mugodzhary mountains' gold ore. Truly, as the saying goes, it is a case of small but precious.

Scientific

TASS Reports 'Mir' Space Activities

Crewmen Hold Press Conference

LD1412180789 Moscow TASS in English 1616 GMT 14 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 14 TASS—By TASS correspondent Rena Kuznetsova:

Soviet cosmonauts Aleksandr Viktorenko and Aleksandr Serebrov today began their hundredth day in space. It is an ordinary working day: medical investigations, astrophysical observations and physical training.

A "spacecraft talking to Earth" press conference was held in the Flight Control Centre, during which journalists could interview crew members.

The journalists were perhaps interested most of all in the cosmonauts' transport vehicle, a tiny spaceship delivered to the Mir complex by the Kvant-2 module. Serebrov was even offended when the TASS correspondent mentioned a "Space bicycle." It is not a "bicycle," the engineer on board quipped, it is a "motorcycle": for it has its autonomous engine enabling the cosmonaut to operate for six hours near the orbital complex, (?manoeuvring around) the orbital complex.

The mission's deputy chief Viktor Blagov told journalists that the first space walk is scheduled for February 1, 1990 to be resumed five days later. The present crew plans five space walks.

The crew members readily showed journalists their premises as well as the Inkubator-2 biotechnical complex to study the growth of birds in zero gravity.

A group of Soviet journalists vying for the participation in a space mission are now undergoing medical checks at the Medicobiological Problems Institute of the USSR Ministry of Public Health.

The cosmonauts were asked about their attitude to a reporter's participation in a space flight.

"We welcome the appearance of a journalist in the spaceship," Viktorenko replied. "However, it is desirable for him to be a specialist in some field. Otherwise he'll be bored by the flight."

The cosmonauts noted that, while working on the spaceship, they do not forget about issues concerning the Soviet people and are closely following the work of the 2nd Congress of People's Deputies.

Work Schedule Reported

LD1512114189 Moscow TASS in English 1137 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 15 TASS—By TASS special correspondent from the Mission Control Centre:

Soviet cosmonauts Aleksandr Viktorenko and Aleksandr Serebrov have now spent one hundred days in space. After the redocking of the cargo craft, the crew continues to reactivate the Kvant-2 module.

There are a considerable amount of systems and equipment, alongside scientific instruments, aboard the re-equipment module. They will be switched into the general circuit of the Mir Station.

To do this, the cosmonauts connected in the past two days power units of the module, the main block and the systems, collecting and transferring telemetric information to Earth.

Today the crew will prepare a new "Elektron" installation, which is an element of the system, ensuring the correct gas composition of the station's atmosphere, and will be used to receive oxygen through water electrolysis.

The cosmonauts feel well. The flight of the Mir station is proceeding normally.

Reportage on Nuclear Power Stations

AES Accidents Listed

PM1112170389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 7

[Unattributed feature incorporating interview with V.A. Sidorenko, first deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Supervision of Safe Working Practices in Industry and the Atomic Power Industry: "Nuclear Power Stations [AES]: Accidents in November. USSR State Committee for Supervision of Safe Working Practices in Industry and the Atomic Power Industry Report on Incidents at Nuclear Power Stations"—no place or date of interview given]

[Text] There were 45 nuclear power units in operation in the USSR in November 1989.

	Reductions in Capacity	Shutdowns
Balakovo Nuclear Power Station [AES]	1	2
Zaporozhye AES	2	1
Ignalina AES	1	nil
Kalinin AES	1	1
Kola AES	nil	1
Rovno AES	nil	2
Smolensk AES	1	1
Chernobyl AES	2	1
South Ukrainian AES	nil	2
Totals	8	11

There was one breach of safe operation limits. The planned sequence of movement of capacity regulating rods was breached at Balakovo AES 28 November in the course of an automatic reduction in capacity due to a defect in the reactor control and protection circuit. Radiation conditions did not exceed the prescribed limits for normal operations anywhere at the stations or controlled zones. No overirradiation was recorded.

V. Sidorenko, first deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Supervision of Safe Working Practices in Industry and the Atomic Power Industry, comments on the statistics.

[Question] Viktor Alekseyevich, today's statistics include cases when nuclear power units were shut down. Did this involve any danger for the environment and the population?

[Sidorenko] As a rule, any unscheduled power unit shutdown or reduction in capacity is a warning. Whenever any of the parameters indicating the unit's condition exceed the permitted safe limits, a protective safety system comes into operation to scram the nuclear reactor. There is no dangerous development of events in such cases, nor does any threat of harmful consequences arise. Many such shutdown cases involve mistakes in servicing or operating the equipment which are not associated with breaches of so-called safe operation limits. We identify in our reports any instances when safe operation limits or conditions are breached as such.

[Question] The statistics make no mention of the fire at Khmelnitskaya AES, which was reported by the central press and television. What could you say about this case, and also about the possible threats associated with a fire at an AES?

[Sidorenko] We report only incidents at operational AES's. The fire which you mentioned occurred on 24 November at the No. 3 unit of Khmelnitskaya AES which is under construction. The power unit is at the intermediate stage of construction, without any equipment or nuclear fuel yet, and consequently there can be no question of any radiation danger.

Specifically: The polyethylene guides—channel tubes in a concrete casing which should house the metallic power cables—caught fire. There were no casualties. According to information at my disposal, the total material damage was assessed by a special commission at R2,600.

[Question] But if a fire does occur at an operational AES, what could be the ensuing consequences?

[Sidorenko] There was an ignition of hydrogen at the No. 1 power unit of Ignalina AES on 25 November, the gas having leaked through a fissure in the turbogenerator cooling system. The turbogenerator was immediately switched off. The ignition was efficiently dealt with by the personnel's own resources. But the power unit was forced to operate at 50-percent capacity for over 24 hours because the turbogenerator was shut down for repairs.

Another example. PRAVDA informed its readers in November of a fire at Spain's "Vandellos" Nuclear

Power Station, describing it as the most dangerous incident since Chernobyl. What actually happened there?

According to a report by the Spanish nuclear supervision body, the fire at the No. 1 power unit of "Vandellos" Nuclear Power Station developed in the evening of 19 October following a hydrogen explosion in the cooling system of one of its two turbogenerators. The fire was extinguished late at night. The fire as such caused no damage at all to the reactor or the circuit containing the radioactive fuel container.

The Spanish public was alarmed—quite justifiably, one must admit—by the fact that the electric motors of the reactor's emergency cooling system were not switched on for several hours because the water used to extinguish the fire had penetrated the reactor building and put a series of electrical systems out of operation. The fire had no further dangerous consequences for the reactor.

The danger caused by fire at an operational AES could be much greater, depending on which power station elements are damaged by fire. Current AES construction regulations are aimed at ensuring that a possible fire does not damage simultaneously several of the systems ensuring reactor safety. Another aspect of the problem involves the use of noncombustible or, as they are called, "fire-resistant" materials and primarily electrical insulation materials.

Nuclear Plant Safety, Closure Examined

PM0412164089 London MORNING STAR in English 4 Dec 89 p 6

[Article by Vladimir Kremnev of the Soviet National Research Institute for Nuclear Power Plant Operation: "New Thinking on How To Shut Nuclear Plants"]

[Text] By 1989, the first two prototype commercial reactors at the Beloyarskaya and Novovoronezhskaya nuclear power plants with a total of 310 megawatts had been shut down for good after the completion of the standard term of operation.

In spring of this year, the two reactors of the Armenian N-plant with a total capacity of 815 megawatts were likewise stopped following the Armenian earthquake of December 1988.

The plant itself suffered no damage, according to Soviet and foreign experts.

The second reactor at the Beloyarskaya N-plant (160 megawatts) is to be shut down before the year is out.

The installations which have completed the standard useful life cycle (around 30 years), including those with a capacity of 1,000 megawatts, are expected to be put out of operation before the turn of the century.

The Chernobyl accident prompted a change in the approach to nuclear plant decommissioning. Had this issue received more careful consideration previously, the going would have been easier now.

The work done in this field prior to 1986 had obviously been insufficient.

So, in 1987, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Poland, and the Soviet Union signed an agreement on joint efforts, to facilitate the modernisation and dismantling of nuclear plants following the completion of the standard term of operation.

A national programme for 1988-1995 is in place in the Soviet Union that seeks the development of modern technological systems for decommissioning nuclear power plants.

A number of establishments are developing and manufacturing special technology for decommissions, including remote-controlled machinery and robots for radiation monitoring and decontamination of premises and equipment.

They will also be able to dismantle structures and buildings and put them into containers. The emphasis is on making such equipment dependable and simple to operate and service.

Devices for removing radio-active components from the operational area and television equipment to monitor the performance of remote-controlled systems are now being developed.

The emphasis here is on electronic, optical and audio devices capable of operating in a radio-active environment.

Electric, pneumatic and hydraulic energy will be transmitted by special cable, and information by both cable and air.

Some of the technology has already been tested at the Chernobyl and Beloyarskaya plants.

At this point, priorities include the storage of large quantities of low- and medium-active recycled waste at the site of the reactor in the process of decommissioning, as well as the preparation and final siting of nuclear waste dumps.

This includes developing technology to gauge radiation levels, and designing special containers and underground vaults.

There are wide-ranging contacts with France, West Germany, Italy and Sweden in this area.

Essentially, the Soviet concept of decommissioning seeks the removal of radioactive material from nuclear sites and its dumping in underground vaults.

It is understood that the time interval between the shutdown and dismantling of a nuclear plant or its reactors may be considerable.

This is necessary to allow radiation levels to fall. But sooner or later it will have aged to the point where its dismantling becomes necessary.

This holds true for reactors that for some reason have to be buried for a long period, as was the case with the fourth Chernobyl reactor.

Dubbed Sarcophagus, it will ultimately be dismantled.

Any process of decommissioning should begin with finding a dumping site for nuclear waste products.

The conditions under which dumping takes place put limits on the technological processes of removal, recycling, canning and transportation.

For this reason, reactor decommissioning cannot go ahead until after the site for "perpetual" burial has been found.

Actual decommissioning should be preceded by three preparatory stages.

The first is feasible only in the case of nuclear plants now on the drawing-boards, where decommissioning is planned out beforehand.

The future decommissioning is taken into account at all design stages.

The second stage involves research to decide whether the reactor should be laid-up or dismantled fully or partly from the moment of its final shutdown to the completion of decommissioning.

Finally, the third stage involves a feasibility study regarding the choice made and the estimation of costs.

In certain cases decommissioning costs could be 30 per cent of the total expenditure on construction.

High priority is being given to the Armenian nuclear plant.

The task in hand is to remove nuclear fuel within the shortest possible time—about two years instead of the four normally required.

AES Construction Policy

LD1412213389

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0900 GMT on 14 December carries an interview with Yuriy Stepanovich Kotov, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet and rector of the USSR's first ecological faculty at Kazan University, by correspondent Zamir Muravyev.

Natalya Vartyanan, editor of SOYUZ, provides introductory remarks. She observes that "today we are unable to regard the Chernobyl tragedy as something that happened by chance, even more so as it is a matter of the safety of the residence of hundreds of thousands of people in the zones of atomic power stations in operation and under construction."

"It is generally recognized that no absolute guarantees against catastrophic accidents of atomic power stations exist. However, up to this day there are still many supporters of atomic power engineering. How, otherwise, can the fact be explained that, disregarding the possible effect of radiation, the construction of atomic power supply stations is being planned within the boundaries of 17 large towns in the country, including the Tatar atomic power station?"

Following this introduction, correspondent Zamir Muravyev interviews Yuriy Stepanovich Kotov. Kotov states that he opposes atomic engineering in principle because, given Soviet technology and Soviet construction standards, the Soviet Union cannot ensure the normal exploitation of atomic power stations. As for the Tatar Nuclear Electrict Power Station (AES) he says that there is totally incontrovertible evidence that the AES is being built on a geological fault, which is impermissible. Also impermissible is the fact that it is being built on the Kama floodplain, lower than the dams of Nizhnekamskaya Hydroelectirc Power Station. He points out that if these dams burst, the reactor is sure to be flooded—this can easily be modelled.

After conducting an independent examination of the building site, Kazan geologists came to the conclusion that this is an active tectonic fault and the force of six earthquakes which were observed there quite recently can lead to irreparable consequences. The government commission decided to allocate R5,000,000 to mothball the Tatar AES and to stop construction from 1 January.

That decision was taken by "our" Council of Ministers and the government commission, he stresses. Kotov says that he is personally opposed in principle to such a stance and that the protest march was aimed precisely at getting construction stopped now, without delay. He questions: Why invest another R100,000,000 there when it can be used for any other purpose? Why spend money uselessly?

The Bashkir public has been very active. This protest march was attended by representatives of the Bashkiria from Ufa, Izhevsk, Nabarezhnyye Chelny, and Beloyarsk. All of them oppose the construction of the Bashkir atomic power station. The point is that the Bashkir AES has also been sited in violation of the rules and conditions of the International Atomic Energy Agency on the confluence of the Belaya and the kama on a continuation of the fault on which the Tatar AES stands.

"And this criminal hand which planted most stations in this way, where in the end, they either explode or at the experience a breakdown should be stopped. I believe that this is not at all a coincidence because this applies to the Rovno station which was sited on karst, to the Crimea station which was sited in a seismic zone, to our two stations, to the Ulyanovsk station, which was sited on

limestone, to the Minsk station, to the Gorkiy thermal station. The design institutes were not known to anyone, nor were the authors of the plans, of course. By the way, the Tatar AES is being built without a plan altogether," Kotov concludes.

Military

Lizichev Attends Academy Jubilee Meeting

PM1412164989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Dec 89 Single Edition p 1

[Unnamed own correspondent report: "Ceremony"]

[Text] A ceremony devoted to the 70th anniversary of the V.I. Lenin Military-Political Academy took place in Moscow in the Soviet Army's Central Academy Theater. Colonel General N.F. Kizyun, chief of the academy, gave the report.

Army General A.D. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, addressed those participating in the meeting. He read out a greetings message from the CPSU Central Committee on the occasion of the 70th anniversary since the academy was formed.

A.N. Soshnikov, first deputy chief of a CPSU Central Committee Department, attended the ceremony.

Tallinn Conference Views Draft Changes

PM1212100189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 9 Dec 89 First Edition p 5

[Feature comprising report by TASS correspondents A. Kharchenko and V. Khyuva and commentary by Lieutenant General N.G. Ter-Grigoryants, deputy chief of the Ground Forces Main Staff: "Turning to Face the Soldier"]

[Text] Tallinn—A conference of party and soviet workers and representatives of the Tallinn Garrison and the public has been held at the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee on the question of organizing active military service in the USSR Armed Forces.

Major General R. Pyder, republic military commissar, delivered the report. He made a number of proposals, in particular on mounting the draft campaign only in the fall, when young people have already gotten their bearings, and on involving reserve servicemen in camps set up to carry out national economic work.

Kh. Eller, head of the State and Legal Department, spoke about the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee's study of this question and named the priority tasks: To examine legislative initiatives on alternative forms of fulfilling military duty, and on the possibility of forming national-territorial military units and organizing primary military training.

A TASS correspondent asked Lieutenant General N.G. Ter-Grigoryants, deputy chief of the Ground Forces Main Staff, to comment on this report:

I share the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee conference participants' concern. Their proposals mainly reflect the actual state of affairs. For example, the proposal to draft the young generation once a year.

Why has this problem arisen? Largely because instances whereby young people are reluctant to fulfill their constitutional duty have recently been increasing in frequency. This is particularly characteristic of the Transcaucasus and Baltic republics.

Military commissariats have been left face to face with all these difficulties. The switch to one annual draft would significantly facilitate their work. Proposals similar to the one made by Maj Gen R. Pyder are coming from many military commissariat leaders.

However, a careful study of them has revealed a mass of complexities. I will dwell on some of them. A draft conducted once a year will undoubtedly harm the combat readiness of the Armed Forces. Because 50 percent of inducted personnel will have to be transferred to the reserve at one time.

Further, the Armed Forces need trained people. Thus, the need will arise to double the number of training units, as well as the complement of officers and NCO's in them and the training materials base. Each draft will require additional material expenditure.

Or the question: How many months does it to take to train a soldier? If it takes six months, this means that the training units will be empty the rest of the time. We are not so rich that we can afford such extravagance. If we increase the training course to one year, how much time will the serviceman have left to apply in practice the knowledge he has acquired?

Complexities will also arise over getting personnel to and from their place of service.

I will point out that the young generation is drafted twice a year in the GDR, Czechoslovakia, and Poland, and four times in France and the FRG.

Nevertheless, a draft once a year is possible, but only with a considerable reduction in the Armed Forces and a radical change in the organizational structure and qualitative predraft training of the young generation.

As regards alternative service, we are not opposed to a positive solution to this question.

But is it realistic? Will young people conscientiously fulfill their duties in medical establishments, let us say? Will we not get an increase in juvenile crime instead of alternative service?

As for Kh. Eller's proposal to form national-territorial military units, I will state unambiguously that, proceeding from the tasks of the Armed Forces and the reasonable need to ensure the state's defense capability, the creation of national formations is unacceptable. We must keep a sense of reality in resolving such questions. Is it possible to protect the country today by covering a tiny scrap of the border—in Estonia or Armenia? Armed Forces personnel ensure the Soviet people's security beyond the Arctic Circle, in the Pamir Mountains, and on the ocean expanses. Is this not a common concern? Must the burden not be shared equally among all?

The proposal for national-territorial formations is unrealizable from the viewpoint of the availability of officer cadres, trained specialists, and the appropriate training materials base in the republics. The resolution of these questions will entail new expenditure. Why should draftees in the Baltic or Transcaucasus regions have privileges? In that case it would be fair to allow young men from Orel and Smolensk to serve in their home districts.

In order to bring the said problems into line with the demands of the times, the question of the draft and the performance of active military service must be examined at the USSR Supreme Soviet. Clearly, people must be drafted into the Armed Forces not by order of the USSR defense minister, but by a special resolution of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Soldiers From Uzbekistan, Caucasus Clash 12 Dec

LD1412114789 Moscow International Service in Spanish 2200 GMT 13 Dec 89

[From the "Soviet Chronicle" program]

[Text] Mass disturbances took place last night [12 December] at a military unit stationed in the Urals. Some 700 troops took part in the disturbances and several injuries were reported. In this armed confrontation, there were clashes between privates and sergeants from Uzbekistan and the Caucasus. Interior troops helped officers and noncommissioned officers from the unit to restore order.

In the opinion of the unit's political chief, the clash was due to a bowl of jam being accidentally knocked over. The incident is being investigated by the military prosecutor's office.

Restricted Border Zones To Be Reduced

LD1412184489 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 14 Dec 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The leadership of the USSR Border Guards has proposed that closed border zones be reduced by 10%. Here is a report from the western border:

[Begin recording] [Reporter A. Guretskiy] This is the Red Banner Derzhinskiy border detachment. Service at such famous outposts is still considered a privilege for conscripts. But under conditions of international detente and a desire for extensive contacts, our border is changing. With me is A.N. Tikhonov, deputy chief of staff of the border guard detachment. What changes in your detachment's sector would you draw attention to?

[Tikhonov] What can I say? A border is a border. But under the new conditions, much is already being done to remove the restrictions and reduce the border zone to a minimum; that is, the border is functioning on the basis of human contact.

[Guretskiy] During our stay at the Derzhinskiy detachment, the fence at one of the sectors of the state border was taken down. An unusual occurrence, but this is the influence of the times. Moreover, taking everything into account, the border is not shifting its attentions to anyone new. As the leadership of the border guards stated at the USSR Supreme Soviet, the border guards are not asking for a state subsidy. [end recording]

Military Contribution to Economy Detailed

LD1412143889 Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 14 Dec 89

[Text] The Soviet Armed Forces have turned half a billion rubles-worth of material values over to the national economy in the past year. For example, 7,000 military road vehicles and 370 tanks have been re-equipped for civilian use. More than 3,000 tanks are being dismantled. All this is being done under the current program of armed forces reductions. The program proceeds strictly on schedule and on some indices, even ahead of schedule. The facts were disclosed by Government Spokesman [name indistinct]